國史浮海開新錄

余英時教授榮退論文集

周質平
Willard J. Peterson ◎編



本書收錄2001年5月4日至5日，美國普林斯頓大學東亞系為余英時教授榮退舉辦之國際學術研討會所發表之論文。

論文包括宋明元清以至民國以後之思想史中英文專題研究。作者為來自美國、台灣、香港和中國大陸相關領域之學者專家，為研究思想史學者之重要參考資料。

金耀基：中國儒學文明的現代轉向與文

林富士：試論六朝時期的道巫之別

康　樂：素食與中國佛教

Jo-shui Chen：Anti-Buddhism and Intellectual Conditions in Sixth and Seventh Century China

陸　揚：從西川和浙西事件論元和政治格局的形成

Hoyt Cleveland Tillman：Praying to the Spirit of Confucius and Claiming the Transmission of the Way: Linking Zhu Xi's Views on *Guishen* and the *Daotong*

David Gedalecia：The Tseng Tien Spirit

黃進興：武廟的崛起與衰微(七至十四世紀)——一個政治文化的考察

冀小斌：北宋積貧新解——試論「國用不足」與王安石新法之爭

Kent Guy：Inspired Tinkering: The Qing Creation of the Province

Thomas H. C. Lee：Alphonsus Vagnoni and His *Western Learning on Personal Cultivation*: The First Introduction of St. Thomas's Ethical Ideas in Chinese

Willard J. Peterson：Changing Literati Attitudes toward New Learning in Astronomy and Mathematics in Early Qing.

王汎森：清初士人的悔罪心態與消極行為——不入城、不赴講會、不結社

羅志田：學術與國家——北伐前後「國學」的學科定位與認同危機

周質平：胡適的反共思想

河田悌一：民國初期近代學術研究之成立——整理國故與戴震評價

Fong-ching Chen：Some Thoughts on the Significance of Confucianism in the New Millennium



ISBN 957-08-2441-7
00800
9 789570 824414

國史浮海開新錄

—余英時教授榮退論文集—

周質平
Willard J. Peterson ◎編

國家圖書館出版品預行編目資料

國史浮海開新錄：余英時教授榮退論文集/ 周質平、Willard J. Peterson 主編 .
--初版 . --臺北市：聯經，2002 年（民 91）
608 面：17×23 公分 .

ISBN　957-08-2441-7(平裝)

1.文學-中國-論文,講詞等

601.9207　　　　91008657

中文序

鷫鷞救火

——余英時先生的中國情懷

周質平

普林斯頓大學東亞系講座教授余英時先生在2001年6月底榮退，系中同事爲了向余先生表示敬賀之意，特別請了多位他的同事和學生於5月4、5兩日，在普大舉行爲期兩天的「中國的過去與將來」國際學術討論會。本文集所收主要是在這次研討會上發表的論文。

余先生是國際知名的學者，於中國史學研究有多方面開創性的貢獻，他的學術思想博大精深，研究範圍縱橫三千年中國思想史，成就和影響，非我所能言。我想藉這篇短文談談他特有的一種情懷。這種情懷用余先生自己的話來說，就是「中國情懷」。

當然，海外中國人多少都有一點中國情懷。但是一般人的中國情懷，大多只是表現在對故土或故鄉的思念上，這樣的中國情懷，往往流於一種情緒，這種情緒還多少帶著些排外的意味。

余先生的中國情懷絕不是一種帶著排外意味的感傷懷舊情緒，而是一種對中國人苦難的悲憫。他曾在《明報月刊》上，以〈常僑居是山，不忍見耳〉爲題，談他自己的「中國情懷」。這個題目用的是周亮工《因樹屋書影》中的一個故事：

> 昔有鸚鵡飛集陀山，乃山中大火，鸚鵡遙見，入水濡羽，飛而灑之，天神言：「爾雖有志意，何足云也？」對曰：「常僑居是山，不忍見耳！」天神嘉感，即為滅火。

當然，余先生用這個典故來談自己的「中國情懷」，他正是以故事中的「鸚鵡」自況。而他眼中的中國也正是鸚鵡遙見的「陀山」，他不忍見中國之毀於大火，於是著書立說，奮其如椽巨筆，爲他不能忘情的故國做滅火的工作。余先生在他的文章中，用「知其不可而爲之」，「明其道不計其功」，「只問耕耘，不問收穫。」這幾句話來描述鸚鵡救火的精神。我們看看余先生這幾十年來，對當代中國的關懷，上引的幾句話用到他自己身上，真是再恰當不過了。

誠如我的同事Willard Peterson教授在他英文序中所說：這座著火的山，不僅意味著中國，也象徵著飽經西潮衝擊的中國文化。在余先生宏富的著作中，中國文化的重建，始終是他極爲關切的議題。從這個角度而言，余先生的關懷絕不只是當代中國，而是文化繼絕的「千歲之憂」。鸚鵡救火正如愚公移山是知其不可而爲之的精神，更是任重道遠的事業。

余先生絕不只是一個終日坐在書房，埋首在故紙堆裡的學者。他有深切的現世關懷。這種對現世的關懷也就是他「中國情懷」的體現，這一情懷一方面表現在對不同意見的容忍上，另一方面則體現在對集權暴力的抗爭上。1989年6月4日之後，余先生對流亡海外的中國學者和民運人士所給予的關懷和援助，正是容忍和抗爭的一個結合。每讀余先生有關當代中國的時論，都讓我想起東漢、北宋的太學生，明末的東林、復社，晚清的「公車上書」，五四時代的《新青年》，抗戰前夕的《獨立評論》。余先生批評的精神，代表的是中國兩千年來優良的清議傳統。這一精神在1949年之後的中國大陸，已徹底死亡。即使在海外港台，也

如空谷足音。余先生不但是周亮工《書影》中的「鸚鵡」，也是胡適《嘗試集》中「不能呢呢喃喃討人家的喜歡」的「老鴉」。

研究中國歷史是余先生畢生志業之所在，中國歷史對他來說，絕不「只是一個客觀的研究對象」而是「一個千載後的子孫來憑弔祖先所踏過的足跡」。這絕不是說余先生的歷史研究是不客觀的，借用陳寅恪評馮友蘭《中國哲學史》的話來說，余先生與「立說的古人，處於同一境界」，因此他對古人，不但有「了解的同情」，也有「同情的了解」。在近現代中國思想史的研究上，他與戴震、章學誠、胡適、陳寅恪、錢穆這些前輩學者是同其呼吸的。這種精神尤其體現在他對陳寅恪的研究上。余先生對陳寅恪所標榜的「獨立之精神，自由之思想」真是三致其意，因為這兩點也正是余先生自己的信仰。

余先生多年來在海外嚴肅的用中文發表學術著作。這不但提升了中文著作在海外的學術地位，同時也提升了海外中國研究的水平。打破了美國學界視中文著作為次等的偏見和歧視。余先生在這方面的貢獻是遍及整個漢學界的。受惠最深的是所有海外從事中國文史研究的中國學者。這點觀察和感受也許不是一般國內的學者所能深知。

讀過余先生著作的人，大多不免為其廣徵博引、中西融貫的立論所折服。但他之所以引用西方理論，誠如他自己在〈關於新教倫理與儒學研究〉一文所說，「絕非為了證實或否證任何一個流行的學說。」而只是一種「參證比較之資」，換言之，並不是用西方學說來作為研究中國文史的「理論架構」。他深信：「沒有任何一種西方的理論或方法可以現成地套用在中國史的具體研究上面。」余先生的著作為「許多迷失在五花八門的西方理論中的人」，提供了一個新典範。（參見余英時，〈《中國哲學史大綱》與史學革命〉）

本論文集的出版，除了要向與會的各位作者致謝外，特別感謝普林斯頓大學東亞系的史潔芳(Hue Su)小姐，她為這次學術會議的召開，在組織和安排上出力最多，在論文集定稿期間，她多次與作者聯繫，任勞

任怨。當然，沒有聯經出版公司劉國瑞先生和林載爵兄的熱心支持，本文集是不可能及時出版的，在此一併致謝。

Introduction:

A Reflection on Studying History

Willard J. Peterson

In his introduction to this book, Professor Chou Chih-ping cites Professor Yu Ying-shih's use of Chou Liang-kung's seventeenth-century account of the bird who, when asked why he is dropping water from his feathers onto a raging fire on a mountain even though he knows the amount of water is insufficient, explains that having nested on that particular mountain, he cannot bear to see it burn. This is a potent image. We should notice that Chou Liang-kung's story refers to a great fire on the mountain (山中大火), which evokes the Hsiang(象)of the Lü(旅)Hexagram, which is "Fire on the mountain."(山上有火)

As Professor Chou Chih-ping points out, Professor Yu Ying-shih used the story to analogize the need to do something to help, whatever the effects might turn out to be. In the simplest, perhaps overly simplified terms, the analogues are Professor Yu Ying-shih as the bird, his actions and his words, especially in his writings, as the water, and "China" (the problematic term here) as the mountain on fire. The reader no doubt can provide other applications of the analogy.

I would like to turn the analogy to the project that resulted in the

chapters presented in this book. I would take the vulnerability of the Chinese cultural tradition as the mountain, the authors of the essays collected here as small birds, and the essays themselves as water droplets, however inadequate they might appear. What do I mean?

When Professor Chou Chih-ping and I determined to assemble scholars to honor Professor Yu Ying-shih on the occasion of his retirement from the faculty of Princeton University, we realized that we had to set arbitrary restrictions in order to have a manageable number of participants. Instead of inviting scholars in all the fields of Chinese studies in which Professor Yu Ying-shih has made, and continues to make, monumental contributions, we would only invite papers from scholars who had been graduate students under his direction at the University of Michigan, Harvard University, Yale University, and Princeton University, at all of which he held faculty appointments. We left out graduate students and colleagues at many other institutions whom he advised and nurtured. We grouped the contributors of papers into panels on Chinese history, and then asked some of Professor Yu Ying-shih's faculty colleagues at Princeton to serve as discussants; some of us subsequently added essays to this project. We also invited representatives from Professor Yu Ying-shih's non-Princeton institutions to serve as chairs of the panel sessions and as discussants at a final panel on present-day implications of China's past. We were thus led to the title, China's Present, China's Past, to reflect the conference at which the papers were presented in May 2001.

China's past in China's present also reflects a characteristic in Professor Yu Ying-shih's own published work on China, which includes Chinese cultural traditions, Chinese history, Chinese literature, and Chinese politics.

There is a vast literature on the uses of history, the uses of the past, the

contemporary relevance of past events, and so on. Historians are never innocent of purpose, even if they are ignorant of implications. Beginning at least with the early documents transmitted in the *Shu ching*(書經，尚書), the past(*ku* 古)is cited to explain and moderate the present(*chin* 今). As historiographical traditions develop, with various sub-genres and varying standards of accuracy, toleration of emendation and distortion, and literary quality, history writers in China were not expected, at least not before contacts with some later European traditions, routinely to shut their present-day eyes and look only at the past. The act of writing about some aspect, however detailed, of the history of the tradition is to add to that vital historical tradition, and in an important sense, that historical tradition is a major component of our present idea of China(中國), This is a "use of the past" that is fundamental.

Through the twentieth century, challenges to the historical tradition that may have been construed as "China" came from several quarters, including some modernizers and patriots. To recall the analogy of the bird dropping water from its feathers, if we take ongoing threats to the integrity of the historical tradition as fire on the mountain, then Historian Yu must try to put out the fire without knowing the long-term effect of his efforts.

We should be optimistic. The historical tradition, the use of the past to create "China", has been maintained for thousands of years, mountains do not easily burn down. Second, Historian Yu has contributed massively, in terms of the numbers of his books, articles and lectures, and broadly, in terms of the topics, periods and source materials he has ranged over in his research, and deeply, in terms of the density of detail he has discovered and the profundity of his insights, to the maintenance and strengthening of historians' understanding of the tradition; in an age of ambivalence, doubt and post-

modern posing, Historian Yu has succeeded in writing history that is evidenced and judicious. Read his books. This book illustrates the third reason for optimism.There are ongoing generations of historians who take up the task of wetting their feathers(which now normally means immersing themselves in the labor of acquiring a Ph.D.)and dropping some water to try to put out the fire of anti-historical thinking and practice. In different ways and different degrees, all of the contributors of this collection of papers are demonstrating, however inadequately, respect for Professor Yu Ying-shih as Historian. I leave it to each reader to judge how the individual papers use China's past to resonate with issues in China's present.

目　次

中國儒學文明的現代轉向與文化重構

金耀基
香港中文大學副校長

一、前言

在全球化的挑激下，一個很有意思的現象是，一方面學者把注意力集中在「全球社會」的出現與建構上，「羅馬俱樂部」出版《第一次全球革命》[1]是一個有代表性的例子，而另一方面，學者把久已疏用的「文明」重新帶回到人文與社會科學的論述中來[2]。亨丁頓(S. Huntington)的《文明衝突與世界秩序的再建》[3]無疑是最著名的。亨丁頓認爲一個以文明作爲論述基元的典範(a civilizational paradigm)所提供

1 *The First Global Revolution*, by Club of Rome(1992).

2 參Roland Robertson, "Global Theory and Civilization Analysis," in his *Globalization* (London: Sage Publications, 1992), pp.129-137.

3 *The Clash of Civilizations and Re-making of World Order*(NY: Simon & Schuster, 1996).

的圖象使我們能夠了解進入新紀元的世界面貌。在後冷戰的世界，他指出，民族與民族之間最重要的區別不是意識型態、政治或經濟，而是「文化」，而依文化之別，則今天所呈現者則是一個有七至八個的多元文明的世界，其中之一便是中國的儒學文明。在十九世紀末葉，西方敲叩中國大門之前，中國是一個自成天下格局的帝國文明體、德國哲學家耶士培（Karl Jaspers）把中國與印度、希臘、近東列爲世紀前的世界上的幾個「軸心期文明」[4]，中國這個「軸心期文明」，有極繁富豐厚的文化，不論在所謂的「物質」或「精神」領域都有偉大的成就，如書畫、文學、音樂、印刷、建築，乃至日常所用的器皿等，都是戛戛獨造，精彩曼妙的文化產物。應指出者，本文所指的中國傳統文化是指塑造中國傳統社會秩序的價值系統與制度設計。而要講塑造中國傳統社會的價值系統與制度設計則不能不講儒家。中國自秦漢以降，形成一廣土眾民的大帝國，擁有一個統一的政治體系及一個統一的文字傳統，我們可以說傳統中國是一文化、一社會，這個文化以儒學價值系統爲主導，這個社會以儒學的制度設計爲基調。這個文化社會就是中國的儒學文明。

二、儒家的文化設計

秦統一六國，創建了帝國體系，君權凌駕一切，天子稱皇帝，皇帝不止爲國家元首，且是國家之化身，這種基於法家思想的君主制，漢代承而繼之，唯漢武帝接受董仲舒之議，「推明孔氏，抑黜百家」，把儒家推到國家意理之地位。自此儒法並存或外儒內法，此漢宣帝之所以自謂「漢家自有制度，本以霸王道雜之」（《漢書・元帝本紀》）。漢之後

---

4 參Benjamin Schwartz, *The World of Thought in Ancient China,*(Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Unviersity Press, 1985), pp. 2-3.

一直到清末，帝國的制度結構與儒家的思想是互爲表裡的。儒家的一套規範理論不僅爲帝國的君主制提供了「正當性」，並且滲透到國家與社會各個制度領域，中國傳統社會是以儒家爲基調展現的制度秩序。所以，自漢代之後，在帝國體系下的儒家，我稱之爲「制度化儒學」(institutional Confucianism)。在一定的意義上，儒家是有一套建構「社會一政治」秩序的方案，可稱之爲「儒家的文化設計」(Confucian Project)。而由儒家的文化設計建構的則是儒學文明的「社會一政治」的秩序。

(一)儒家的政治秩序觀

史華慈(B. Schwartz)認爲中國文化中所共有的文化取向是：一個普遍的「社會一政治」的秩序觀。在這個秩序觀中，顯化了秩序在「神聖界」與「俗世界」中的優位性與整體性。他說：「那種關於普遍的，無所不包的社會政治秩序觀乃是一種基於宇宙論的普遍王權爲中心的。」同時，「普遍王權或他所佔據的權位是一種在人的社會與宇宙的統治力量之間構成主要聯繫的制度」[5]。普遍王權通過「天命論」而形體化於代表國家的天子身上，天子乃被賦予了形塑與轉化人間的社會政治秩序的使命。韋伯(M. Weber)看到中國的君主就如同一位教皇，中國的皇帝是運用真正意義上的卡里斯瑪型的權威進行統治的[6]。宇內唯一的君王在其人格中體現著凌駕於神聖的和世俗的政治社會領域之上的至高權威，這一點充分體現在「普天之下，莫非王土;率土之濱，莫非王臣」的說法中。在這裡，我要指出，在傳統中國，政治是居於極重要的

---

5 Benjamin Schwartz, "The Primacy of Political Order in East Asian Societies: Some Preliminary Generalizations," in S. R. Schram ed., *Foundations and Limits of State Power in China*(Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press, 1987), p.2.

6 Max Weber, *The Religion of China*(NY: The Free Press, 1964), p.31.

地位的，儒家的「內聖外王」的理想就是要通過政治來實現的。「內聖」屬於道德倫理範疇，「外王」屬於政治範疇，而在儒家思維中，這二者是不可分的，由於君主居於國家社會的中樞位置，故期望他是一有德的君主，也即「聖王」，然後可以「作之君，作之師」，故而，儒家的文化設計是政治與道德合一的，是「政教合一」的。這裡講的「教」不是西方的教會，而是指中國儒家的教化系統。中國理想的政治是「仁政」，是「民本」之治，儒家對政治社會的秩序的建構，其著眼點是義務，是責任，而不是權利，錢穆認為中國是以義務責任為本位的君職政治[7]。換言之，儒家對統治的「正當性」有一定的要求，以是即使在「天命」說中，亦是要天子去盡天子之責。天子如不盡君職，則人民就可以起來加以放逐、易位。所謂「君不君」則民亦可不民。孔子說「湯武革命，順乎天而應乎人」，孟子更說：「聞誅一夫，未聞弒君也。」荀子雖然尊君，但亦謂「臣或弒其君，下或殺其上，無它故也，人主自取之也。」這顯示儒家承認人民對暴君有合法的「叛亂權」，亦是正當的「革命權」。究其實，這是儒家的「正名」主義的中心思想，所謂「君君、父父、臣臣、子子」就是規範政治與社會的角色系統。

整體地宏觀來看，儒家的道德政治在中國並沒有能真正落實，也即儒家為政治提出的「文化設計」並未完全變成事實。宋代大儒朱熹曾說「千五百年之間，正坐為此，所以只是架漏牽補過了時日，其間雖不無小康，而堯舜三王周公孔子所傳之道未嘗一日得以行於天地之間也」。實際上，「普遍王權」理論，通過君主及有儒家經典訓練的士大夫為主體的「官僚結構」，發展了一個龐大的行政導向的帝國。在現實世界，「聖王」少見，而「王聖」則多有，王權之外根本排除了社會上其他獨立勢力發展之可能性，徐復觀指出秦漢以來中國的政治現實上是一專制制度，他說:「無任何力量可對皇帝的意志能加以強制，這才是我的所

7 錢穆，《國史新論》（台北、香港：自印本，1953），頁34。

謂專制的真實內容」，又說「最主要的一點是，任何社會勢力，一旦直接使專制政治的專制者及其周圍的權貴感到威脅時，將立即受到毀滅性打擊，沒有任何社會勢力可以與專制的政治勢力，作合理地、正面地抗衡乃至抗爭」[8]。無可諱言，在儒家的文化設計中，對王權並無制度的制衡。中國的城市，都是王權延伸的「行政」結構，是王權的堡壘，沒有像西方城市那樣，有「自治特權」，中華帝國是受食君之祿的官僚集團所統治的，從沒有出現過西方的「市民社會」。儒學，如韋伯所指出，是「食祿者的身份倫理(status ethic)」。而中國的法令是「法典化的倫理規範，而非法律規範」[9]，瞿同祖認爲傳統中國的法律是「儒學化」了的，亦即是儒家倫理融入了中國的法律[10]。應指出者，中國儒學化的法律並沒有，也不能發展出「法治」(rule of law)的理念，因爲這與儒家的「聖王」的道德政治的理念是不相孚的。

(二)「制度化儒學」的根核

如果說，儒家的文化設計的理想在中國的政治上並沒有得到真正實行，但它在中國的社會卻在很大程度上把理論變爲生活的實踐，亦即儒家的文化觀念在日常生活中積淀，成爲慣習，成爲「天經地義」了。傳統中國廣大的鄉土社會，誠如費孝通所說的，是一個「沒有政治的，有的祇有教化」的社會，這個教化是依儒家長幼之序建立的「長老統治」，也是依儒家傳統建立的「禮治秩序」。這個「禮治秩序」並不是指文質彬彬，像鏡花緣裡所描寫的君子國一般的社會，而是指人之行爲合於儒家禮教的倫理規範的社會[11]。儒家的文化設計，真正在傳統中國

8 徐復觀，《兩漢思想史》(台北：學生書局，1978)，頁134-152。

9 見Max Weber, *The Religion of China*, p. 102.

10 Tung-Tsu Chu(瞿同祖), *Law and Society in Traditional China*(Mouton: The Hague, Netherlands, 1961).

11 費孝通，《鄉土中國》，見其中〈禮治秩序〉與〈長老政治〉篇。

形成制度，而發生巨大深遠影響的是中國的家庭，或更確切地說，是中國的家族制度。梁任公說「吾國社會之組織以家族爲單位，不以個人爲單位，所謂家齊而後國治也。」馮友蘭則更認爲「家族制度就是中國的社會制度」[12]。誠然，中國人常只知有家而不知有社會，在中國，一般人的心理上，國家之外就是家，因此常以「家國」並稱。而中國人在「家」裡，是生活在種種的倫理關係中，他可以是父、是子、是兄、是弟，但如梁漱溟所言，他就「沒有個人的觀念」[13]，就此而言，儒家文化理念中雖然也重己、重自我，但沒有西方的個人主義的思想[14]。

儒家爲社會群體設計的最重要的行爲規範是五倫。五倫就是人與人之間的關係秩序，社會中任何人都被納入這個五倫的層系組織中。五倫是指「父子、君臣、夫婦、兄弟、朋友」。我們可以看到五倫中有三倫是關於家庭中人的，於此可見家之重要性。這五倫又是以「父子」一倫爲主軸，儒家對於這個主軸關係以「孝」的觀念加以維繫。在影響無比深遠的《孝經》一書中，孝的概念被推到了中國倫理系統中的中央位置上。儒家整個理想落實到社會上來，便是一以孝爲基礎的倫理世界。特別應指出者，漢代之後出現的「三綱」說，(即君爲臣綱，父爲子綱，夫爲妻綱)，近人雖有指出此非先秦原始儒家所有[15]，但「三綱」「五倫」卻是「制度化儒家」的核心價值系統，二千年來成爲規範傳統中國政治與社會的「名教綱常」。清代儒學名臣曾國藩給他兒子的家訓中說：

---

12 見Fung Yu-lan(馮友蘭), *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*, ed. by D. Bodde, (NY: Macmillan), p.21.

13 梁漱溟，《中國文化要義》(香港：集成圖書公司，1963年)，頁91。

14 Ambrose Y C King, "The Individual and Group in Confuciansim: A Relational Perspectives," in Donald J. Munro, ed., *Individualism and Holism: Studies in Confucian and Taoist Values*(Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1985).

15 徐復觀，〈中國孝道思想的形成、演變及其歷史中的諸問題〉，收入徐復觀《中國思想史論集》(台中：東海大學，民國48年)。

> 羅婿性情可慮，然此亦無可如何之事，爾當諄囑三妹，柔順恭謹，不可有片言違忤三綱之道。君為臣綱，父為子綱，夫為妻綱，是地維之所賴以立，天柱之所賴以尊……君雖不仁，臣不可以不忠；父雖不慈，子不可以不孝；夫雖不賢，妻不可以不順……[16]。

從這裡，可見「名教綱常」之深入人心，三綱五倫是真正「制度化」了。史學家陳寅恪在〈王觀堂先生輓詞序〉上說，「吾中國文化之定義，具於《白虎通》三綱六紀之說，其意義爲抽象理想最高之境，猶希臘柏拉圖所謂Idea者」。他又敏銳地指出「夫綱紀本理想抽象之物，然不能不有所依託，以爲具體表現之用；其所依託以表現者，實爲有形之社會制度」。陳寅恪把《白虎通》的三綱六紀說成是中國文化之「定義」，顯然是他極重視中國的儒家制度，或制度化了的儒家文化理念。制度化了的儒學的文化理念界定了中國儒學文明的特性。

在此，應一提者，《白虎通》中的「六紀」與「五倫」一樣，都是規範人與人之關係者[17]。更應指出者，「五倫」，「六紀」中之人與人之權義關係是對稱性的，而「三綱」則是片面的絕對性的權義關係[18]。在一定意義上，君臣一綱強化了中國的專制性格，而父子一綱助長了中國的父權主義，而夫妻一綱則鞏固了「男尊女卑」之局。

---

16 此段文字見引於李慎之〈獨立之精神，自由之思想一論作為思想家的陳寅恪〉的一篇尚未發表的文稿。

17 所謂六紀，是「謂諸父、兄弟、族人、諸舅、師長、朋友也。」《禮・樂記》正義，引《禮緯含文嘉》曰：「六紀，謂諸父有善，諸舅有義，族人有敘，昆弟有親，師長有尊，朋友有舊。」

18 梁任公說：「後世動謂儒家言三綱五倫，非也，儒家只有五倫，並無三綱、五倫全成立於相互對等關係之上」見《先秦政治思想史》（台北：中華書局，民國45年），頁75。

三、中國儒學文明的「現代轉向」

中國「制度化儒學」建構的政治—社會的秩序，一直到十六世紀，可能是世界上最偉大的文明，但是，十六世紀之後，歐洲的文明經過了文藝復興，啓蒙運動，工業革命而急速升起了，中國則在鎖國政策下，相對地落後了。十六世紀葡萄牙從中國手中拿走澳門時，中國還沒有感受到歐洲帝國主義的威脅，但在十九世紀中葉的鴉片戰爭(1840-42)中，中國則真正在西方帝國主義手中嘗到了屈辱的滋味。香港就是在南京條約下割讓給英國的。而1860年，英法聯軍攻打北京，火燒圓明園，才使中國朝野驚覺到古老的中華文明的秩序被推倒了。事實上，歐洲自十九世紀起，已經居於世界霸權的地位[19]。所以，十九世紀中葉，當歐洲帝國主義對中國武力叩關時，滿清大臣如李鴻章之輩便要驚呼這是中國三千年未有之變局了。一點不誇張，中國雄據東亞，數千年來從來沒有遇到過這樣的強敵，更重要的是，這個強敵，不止在「力」上勝過中國，而且可能是一個比中國儒學文明更「先進」的文明。古老的中國面對這個前未之有的挑戰；面對民族的存亡絕續，曾有過種種的回應，但自願與不自願的，自覺與不自覺的，終於出現了一個巨大的「現代轉向」，亦即走上了中國現代化的道路。中國的儒學文明的現代轉向是十九世紀末葉開始的，儘管有種種的曲折與斷裂，整個二十世紀中國就是在走現代化，特別是制度現代化之路。中國的現代化所探索追求的是中國文明的「現代性」，也即是一個中國現代的文明秩序。

---

19 在1800年，歐洲控制了地球表面上35%的土地，到1878年，則增至67%，到1914年，更增至84%。見T. Fieldhouse, *The Colonial Enterprises 1830-1914* (London 1973), p.178.

中國儒學文明的「現代轉向」是指與中國傳統政治與社會的制度相綰結的價值系統的現代轉化，亦即是我所說的「制度化儒學」的解構與變革。「制度化儒學」之解構與變革起源於對儒學之不滿與反動。余英時把大規模的反儒教現象推溯到十九世紀中葉，洪秀全的太平天國運動。太平天國運動代表了中國人第一次利用西方的觀念對自己的文化傳統施以極烈的攻擊[20]。值得注意的是，曾國藩雖為漢人，卻效忠滿清，剷剿太平軍。他的〈討賊檄〉以「名教之大變」爲號召，這顯示在曾國藩心目中，「中國之爲中國」者是其文化，而不在種族，而文化的「中國性」之根核則在其「名教綱常」。到了十九世紀後期西方帝國主義正面入侵中國時，士大夫的回應，基本上都在文化的「認同」(identity)與「變革」上徘徊[21]。換言之，亦即是在文化的「中國性」的保持與變革上掙扎。余英時指出：

> 二十世紀上半葉中國思想的主流實在是環繞著文化認同的問題而發展的。以各種方式出現的中西文化的長期爭論，歸結到最後，只是下面這個問題：在西方文化強烈的衝擊下，現代中國人究竟能不能繼續保持原有的文化認同呢？還是必須向西方文化認同呢？不可否認，以思想界的大趨勢說，向西方文化認同在二十世紀的中國終於取得了主導的地位[22]。

清同治年間，曾國藩、李鴻章與張之洞等人爲了回應西方之挑戰，發起洋務運動，實際上只以「開鐵礦、製船砲」爲中國自強與現代化之

---

20 余英時，〈中國現代價值觀念的變遷〉，收入《現代中國的歷程》(台北：華視文化公司出版，民國81年)，頁154。

21 見金耀基，《中國現代化與知識份子》(台北：中國時報文化公司，1977)，頁24-54。

22 見余英時，《錢穆與中國文化》(上海：遠東出版社，1994)，頁3。

要務，也即只肯承認西方之優勝於中國者在技器，用張之洞的「體用」觀來說，則只肯以西方的爲「用」，而必須以中國的爲「體」。而中國文化之「體」，實不外是「名教綱常」。張之洞說：「三綱爲中國神聖相傳之至教，禮教之本原」[23]。到了戊戌前夕，由於「洋務」之不足，乃有康有爲、梁啓超等領導的維新運動。他們已知「體用」之說之非，已知西方之長不止在技器，更在「政教」，於是要變法改制，這就觸及到作爲中國文化的「體」之「名教綱常」[24]；觸及到「制度化儒學」的內涵了。康梁的變法改制，最有象徵意義的是1905年的「廢科舉、設學校」。這是中國儒家教育制度之結束，現代教育制度的開始，也是中國「士大夫」階層的結束，新知識階層的開始。但是，「制度化儒學」之解體有翻天覆地影響的是其政治體制。孫中山先生領導的共和革命，在1911年推翻了滿清王朝，結束了君主專制創立了亞洲第一個共和國。從這個角度看，「國家儒學體制」已崩解，中國傳統的政治宇宙都變了，四萬萬人都是「皇帝」了。從此，中國走上尋求現代的國家體制，現代的政治秩序的不歸路[25]。

在康梁維新運動中，衝擊「制度化儒學」最凌厲的是六君子死難之一的譚嗣同，他受到西方的宗教和倫理的影響，使他看到三綱五倫的壓制性。他在《仁學》對「名教綱常」提出了激烈的批判，他論人倫關係，首標自由與平等兩原則，而「總括其義，曰不失自主之權而已矣」。余英時說他「這個提法，自然是從個體本位出發的，其中『不失

---

23 張之洞，《勸學篇・序》，即當時思想上極為先進的，如王韜、鄭觀應輩，也仍堅持「綱常則亙古而不變」之說，認為西方「禮樂教化，遠遜中華」。

24 注參周昌龍，〈傳統禮治秩序與五四反禮教思潮〉，收入周著《新思潮與傳統》（台北：時報文化出版公司，1995），頁163-202。

25 關於傳統帝國體系崩潰後，中國走上尋求現代的國家體制的不歸路，參金耀基，〈中國之「現代型國家」的發展困境〉一文，收入金耀基，《中國社會與文化》（香港，牛津大學出版社，1992），頁86至109。

自主之權』一語確實抓住了現代人的本質」[26]。梁啓超的《新民說》則更藉西方現代倫理來宣揚建立中國的新倫理，強調權利思想，強調自由、自治、自尊、進步、合群等新價值觀。

當然，對中國文化產生全面抨擊、重估、批判的則是1919年先后的「五四新文化運動」[27] 新文化運動之所謂「新」，是因爲它提出了一系列的現代觀念、現代價值，而以「科學」與「民主」爲總括性的「目標性價值」(goal value)，新文化運動最撼動人心的還是在抨擊中國的名教綱常。誠然，新文化運動不止在抨擊傳統文化，而且還在建立中國文化新的「定義」，或者說在追求中國文化的「現代性」[28]。新文化運動大將陳獨秀對三綱五倫的批判又較譚嗣同更進一層，他的中心思想是「尊重個人獨立自主之人格，勿爲他人之附屬品」，在他眼中，三綱「率天下之男女爲臣、爲子、爲妻，而不見有一獨立自主之人，三綱之說爲之也」[29]。他認爲「西洋民族以個人爲本位，東洋民族以家族爲本位。」而「東洋民族社會種種卑劣不法慘酷衰微之象」，皆由於家族主義故，從而，他說「欲轉善因，是在以個人本位主義易家族本位主義」[30]。五四時期新文化運動的支配性的文化取向是要推倒以儒學爲基礎的社會制度，尤其是其家族制度，其中更特別抨擊「男尊女卑」，倡導婦女解放。胡適要「重新估定一切價值」，魯迅

26 見余英時，〈中國現代價值觀念的變遷〉，頁194。

27 五四新文化運動應該區分為五四運動與新文化運動，這是兩個性質不同的運動。前者是政治性的，後者是文化性的。見金耀基，〈五四與中國的現代化〉，《新亞月刊》(香港)，1999年6月15日。

28 李歐梵對於五四時代文學的創作的分析指出了其中「追求現代性」的主旨，見李著《現代性的追求》(北京：三聯，2000)，特別見〈追求現代性〉一文，頁177-247。

29 陳獨秀，〈一九一六年〉，《青年雜誌》第1卷第5期(1916年正月號)，頁3。

30 陳獨秀，〈東西民族根本思想之差異〉，《青年雜誌》第1卷第4號(1915年12月15日)，頁1-2。

以名教綱常不外「禮教吃人」[31]，傅斯年則把傳統家庭稱之爲「萬惡之源」[32]。當然，這些看法是過份簡單化的，有激進主義強調「轉化」的傾向[33]。總之，傳統中國社會最重要的家族制度在思想價值層次上，自清末以來，已受到根本性地批判，而到了二十世紀初，更由於社會經濟結構的變化，遂引發了普遍地「家庭革命」。整體來講，由於帝國的君主政制與傳統的家族制度的崩解，「制度化的儒學」不啻是壽終正寢了。對於認同於儒家文明的「名教綱常」的士大夫來說，這無異是中國文化的喪葬，其心境之失落與蒼涼是不言可喻的，但對於建構中國新文化者言，則這是中國的文明的「新生」過程中無可避免的創痛。

四、中國現代文明秩序之建構

「制度化儒學」的壽終正寢，並不表示中國文化的消亡，甚至也不表示儒學的消亡。一百年來，中國文化中的文學、繪畫、音樂，有的雖然已式微，但有的在汲取西方的滋養中卻獲得新的發展。儒家固然已被「去中心化」，已失去過去「獨尊」地位，但儒學因與國家分離，反而回復了先秦原始儒學精神，並在西方文化激盪下，經反思而有再顯生命之機遇。事實上，儒家文化一方面在學術上發展爲「知識性的儒學」(intellectual Confucianism)，「新儒學」即是其中一個特出的表現；另一

31 魯迅在《狂人日記》中寫道「我翻開歷史一查，這歷史沒有年代，歪歪斜斜的每葉上都寫著『仁義道德』幾個字，我橫豎睡不著，仔細看了半夜，才從字縫裏看出來，滿本都寫著兩個字是『吃人』。」(《魯迅全集》，第一卷，頁281。)

32 傅斯年，〈萬惡之原〉，《新潮》創刊號，收入《傅孟真先生集》(台灣大學發行，1952)，第一冊，丙「社會問題」，頁5。

33 黃克武認為清末中國思想界中「轉化」(譚嗣同為代表)與「調適」(梁啓超為代表)兩條思路，但後來愈來愈多的人選擇了前者而放棄後者，黃克武，《一個被放棄的選擇：梁啓超調適思想之研究》(台北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1994)，特別參見第七章。

方面，在日常生活上，則積淀爲「社會性的儒學」(social Confucianism)的價值規範。誠然宏觀地看，整個二十世紀，我們看到的是中國社會的巨大變遷，一個傳統性的中國社會確是一步步走出了中國歷史的舞台，但同時，一個新的中國社會卻在現代化的長路上一步步走來。中國自十九世紀末葉起，已自覺與不自覺地走上現代化的道路。中國儒學文明的「現代轉向」，用墨西哥詩人，諾貝爾文學獎得主巴斯(O. Paz)的說法，是「命定地現代化」[34]，但它也是中國人的選擇，此一選擇涉及到對傳統文化的批判與重估，也涉及到中國「現代性」的創造，在過去一百年中，中國人在現代性的創造過程中，所面臨的最大的問題是建立中國的新制度，是建構中國的現代的文明秩序。

中國社會百年的變遷，在基調上是從一農業社會轉向工業社會。而中國人要建立的工業文明的新秩序，則必須要建立工業文明的種種制度。這包括政治制度、經濟制度、法律制度、教育制度、宗教制度等等。新制度的建立是中國現代文明秩序的基礎，這些制度不僅是舊社會制度的替代，更有些是舊社會所沒有的，而爲新社會所必需的。無疑地，中國在新制度建立的過程是相當艱辛與曲折的。在政治制度與法治的建立上尤其一波三折，困境叢現。但在大方向上，則是向民主政制與法治轉變，就兩岸三地言，台灣在民主政治上走的最快，香港則在法治上最有基礎。而三個儒學文明的社會皆越來越走上市場經濟的軌轍。無可諱言，中國二十世紀所建立的新制度，許多或大部份都是從現代西方借取過來的(依緣於馬克思主義的共產制度也是西方的)。這些「西方」的制度，幾乎全是十八世紀歐洲啓蒙運動之後的「新」的或「現代」的產物。中國，其實，所有非歐美的社會在現代化過程中，都有這種大量「文化借取」(制度與文化是不能完全分開的，制度背後是有文化價

34 Octiva Paz, "The Search for Values in Mexico's Modernization," *Asian Wall Street Journal*, June 1, 1994.

值的支援的)的現象。在這個意義上，中國的「制度現代化」不能不說有濃厚的「西化」性格。

在中國從事現代新制度的建構過程中，固然大量地「借取」了西方的制度，但在「西化」的同時，實際上也是「中國化」的開始。我所謂的「中國化」是指這些制度經「轉化」而變成中國新社會制度的構成部份。任何取意於西方的「制度」，不論是政治的、行政的、經濟的或教育的，在實際建構的過程中，沒有不是傳統文化與西方文化「交涉」的一種結果，值得注意的是，二十世紀下半葉，特別是全球現代化過程中，出現了一個普遍性的文化現象，即非西方社會，包括中國人的社會，因爲現代化之增加，反而對本土文化的認同更增強了。亨丁頓(Huntington)對此很銳敏的觀察：

> 在開始，西化與現代化是緊連在一起的，非西方社會吸收大量的西方文化，逐步地走上現代化。但，當現代化步伐增大後，西化的比重減少了，而本土文化再度復蘇。再進一步的現代化則改變了西方與非西方社會的間權力的平衡，並增強了對本土文化的承諾[35]。

這種對本土文化的重新承諾的現象，在中國言，當然不是、也不可能重新回復「制度化儒學」的地位，也即不是以重建傳統的「名教綱常」來維護文化的「中國性」，而是發掘、運用中國文化的資源來作爲建構中國現代的新制度文化的磚石。在這裡，我想就民主制度來看，在今日中國人心目中是持什麼樣的態度的。1988年，台灣的一個全島性的調查中顯示91.5%的人認爲，民主在個人生活中有重要價值。其中31.2

---

35 S. P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and The Remaking of World*(N.Y. Simon & Schuster, 1996), pp.75-76.

%的人且認為「絕對重要」[36]。在中國大陸，一個1987年中國政治文化與政治態度的調查中，有66.74%的被訪者表示「有必要改革中國的政治體制」，更有75.06%的人相信「中國需要民主」。在香港，一個1986年的調查顯示49%的人同意香港的政治領袖由民選產生較當時的殖民政府更能勝任。[37]在1988年的調查中更發現71.2%的被訪者情願香港政府是民主的，但不是真正強而有力，而只有13.6%的人則情願政府強而有力，但不是真正民主的。[38]從上面的調查中我們可以看到，大陸、台灣與香港這三個中國人的社會，在政治的制度文化上的價值取向，雖然三地的中國人對民主的理解不盡相同，但他們在不同程度上都已認同民主，把民主作為一種建構政治秩序的制度設計了。中國現代的新制度的建構實際上必然會涉及兩個交叉同在的「轉化」，一個是西方的轉化為中國的，一個是傳統的轉化為現代的。我相信，再過百年後，回頭看二十世紀的中國，將會是一個西方制度「中國化」的世紀，也是中國制度「現代化」的世紀。這比起漢之後出現的「佛教中國化」規模更龐大，意義更深遠[39]。有二位社會科學學者從一大量的經驗研究中發現中國傳統文化在中國大陸已經瀕於解體，五倫已變，人際之關係的行為原則已從「義務」本位轉向「權利」本位。他們寫了一本叫《毀壞了的長城》[40]，他們是把「長城」喻為中國傳統文化的。但我覺得，我們應該

36 瞿海源主編《台灣地區社會變遷基本調查計劃，第二期，第五次調查計劃執行報告》（台北：中央研究院民族學研究所，1994年12月），頁117。

37 Lau Siu Kai & Kuan Hsin-chi, *The Ethos of the Hong Kong Chinese*(Hong Kong, The Chinese University Press, 1988), pp.74-74.

38 Lau Siu Kai et al, ed., *Indicators of Social Development, Hong Kong 1988*(Hong Kong: Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1991), p.183.

39 關於「佛教中國化」可參葛兆光，〈七世紀前中國的知識、思想與信仰世界〉，《中國思想史》，第一卷(上海：復旦大學出版社，1998)，頁507-594。

40 Godwin Chu and Yanan Ju, *The Great Wall in Ruins*(NY: State University of New York, 1993).

換一個角度來看這個現象，我們可以說，中國的新制度文化已經出現。中國的新制度文化，講到底，必然也應該看到的是「個人主體性」的覺醒。而在中國儒學文明的「現代轉向」中，最能代表「個人主體性」覺醒的：在政治上是個人之權利觀的肯定，在社會上是婦女之自主性的肯定[41]，這正象徵地說明了中國現代的文明秩序正在形成。

深一層看，正在形成的中國現代文明秩序，雖然具有「西方現代性」的一些質素，但很清楚的是，在全球化的過程中，它並沒有消失了儒學文明的性格。應該指出，全球化不是如有些學者所言，是西方現代性的擴張的結果[42]，實際上，全球化才會「發現」或突顯出「他者」(other)的問題[43]。全球化並沒有使世界出現文化的同質性，更沒有出現一個「全球文化」，恰恰相反，正是全球化才創造了所謂「後現代性狀況」，亦即全球出現文化的多元性與變異性[44]。艾森斯坦(Eisenstadt)就指出，西方現代性的擴散或拓張是一世界性現象，但這卻並沒有促使一個單一文明的出現，而所出現的卻是「多元的現代性」[45]。英格哈特(R. Inglehart)與白克爾(W. E. Baker)，運用「世界價值調查」(world values surveys)的資料(它包括65個社會及全世界75%的人口)，發現世界一方面出現了巨大的文化變遷，另一方面又見到世界不同傳統的持續現象，他們說：

> 我們所目睹的全球經濟的發展，並不是不斷地增加了「同一

---

41 關於中國婦女自主性覺醒的歷史發展，參黃嫣梨，《妝台與妝台以外：中國婦女史研究論集》(香港：牛津大學出版社，1999)。

42 A Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*(Oxford: Polity Press, 1990).

43 R. Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*(London: Sage Publications, 1992), pp.144-145.

44 B. Smart, *Facing Modernity*(London: Sage Publication, 1999), pp.32-33.

45 S. Eisenstadt, "Multiple Modernities in an Age of Globlization"(Truman Institute Reprint since 1988, Hebrew University).


性」，亦即一個西方文化的普遍性形式，而是文明多元性的持續，這是由於非西方文明積極的再新與重構……

他們指出，基督教或伊斯蘭或儒學傳統的歷史都產生了具有特殊價值性格的「文化區域」(cultural zones)，「經濟發展傾向於把不同社會推向一個共同的方向，但卻又不是多種文化的匯聚(converging)，他們似乎朝著他們的文化傳統所型塑的平行軌道移動」[46]。

中國儒學文明的「現代轉向」誠然是一文明的大轉化。但中國現代化的終極目的無非在建構一個中國的現代性，更切實地說，是重建一個新的中國的文明秩序[47]，這個正在形成的新文明秩序，深一層看，則是中國文化與價值的解構後的重構過程。

46 Ronald Inglehart & Wayne E. Baker, "Modernization, Cultural Change, and The Persistence of Traditional Values", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 65(Feb 19-51 2000), pp. 22, 49.

47 金耀基，〈中國現代文明秩序的建構〉，收入金耀基，《中國政治與文化》(香港，牛津大學出版社，1997)，頁177-192。



試論六朝時期的道巫之別

林富士
中央研究院歷史語言研究所研究員

壹、引言

根據春秋時期(770-476 BC)楚國大夫觀射夫(fl. 515-489 BC)的說法，巫覡是中國社會最古老的一種宗教人物[1]。許多古代的文獻和考古所得的文物資料也都顯示，在先秦時期(221 BC之前)，無論是在官方宗教或是民間宗教的領域裡，巫覡都是最有影響力的權威人士[2]。

但是，到了兩漢時期(206 BC-220 AD)，情形便大不相同。

首先，大約從漢武帝的時候(140-87 BC)開始，由於受到儒家官僚的排斥和打擊，巫覡逐漸退出官方宗教(國家「祀典」)的領域，只能在民間活動。接著，到了東漢中晚期的時候(大約西元二世紀)，由於道教的崛起以及佛教傳入中國，巫覡原本在民間宗教中所佔有的優勢地位也

---

1 詳見《國語》(台北：里仁書局，1981)，卷18，〈楚語〉，頁559。

2 詳見K. C. Chang, *Art, Myth, and Ritual: The Path to Political Authority in Ancient China*(Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983), pp. 44-55.

逐漸喪失。巫覡必須和道士、僧尼競爭以吸引信徒[3]。

其中，來自道教的威脅最爲嚴重。因爲，道教是在中國本土「新興」的宗教，早期的道士吸引了不少巫覡的信仰、儀式和法術，刻意搶奪巫覡的信徒，提供了各式各樣的宗教服務(喪葬、醫療、祈福、除災等)[4]。

到了魏晉南北朝(又稱六朝)時期(220-589AD)，隨著道教日益興盛，巫覡在中國宗教市場上的勢力似乎也日漸衰微。因此，研究中國宗教史的學者，大多不再注意巫覡信仰在漢代以後的發展。有人認爲，巫覡信仰已被道教充分吸收，成爲道教信仰的一部分[5]。有人甚至認爲，

---

3 詳見林富士，《漢代的巫者》(台北：稻鄉出版社，1999)，頁27-48；宮川尚志，《六朝史研究・宗教篇》(京都：平樂寺書店，1964)，頁10-26，336-365；宮川尚志，《中國宗教史研究・第一》(京都：同朋舍，1983)，頁175-192。

4 詳見Rolf A. Stein, "Un exemple de relations entre taoïsme et religion populaire," 收載《福井博士頌壽紀念・東洋文化論集》(東京：早稻田大學出版社，1969)，頁79-90；Rolf A. Stein, "Religious Taoism and Popular Religion from the Second to Seventh Centuries," in H. Welch and A. Seidel, eds., *Facets of Taoism: Essays in Chinese Religion*(New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1979), pp. 53-81；羊華榮，〈道教與巫教之爭〉，《宗教學研究》，1996:1(1996)，頁35-42；Chi-tim Lai, "The Opposition of Celestial-Master Taoism to Popular Cults during the Six Dynasties," *Asia Major*, third series, 11:1(1998), pp. 1-20.

5 研究道教起源的學者通常都會指出，道教是在巫覡信仰(或稱之為「巫教」、「巫術」或「巫覡道」)的基礎之上發展而來，至少也會承認，早期道教有不少法術、儀式和信仰都是襲自巫覡的傳統。詳細的說法見陳國符，〈天師道與巫覡有關〉，收入氏著，《道藏源流考》(北京：中華書局，1963)，〈附錄二：道藏劄記〉，頁260-261；許地山，《道教史》(台北：牧童出版社，1976重印)，頁161-182；傅勤家，《中國道教史》(台北：臺灣商務印書館，1980重印)，頁43；卿希泰，《中國道教思想史綱，第一卷：漢魏兩晉南北朝時期》(成都：四川人民出版社，1980)，頁32-34；吳榮曾，〈鎮墓文中所見到的東漢道巫關係〉，《文物》，1981:3(1981)，頁56-63；窪德忠，《道教百話——仙人へのあこがれ》(東京：世界聖典刊行協會，1983)，頁25；丁煌，〈漢末三國道教發展與江南地緣關係初探——以張陵天師出生地傳說、江南巫俗及孫吳政權與道教關係為中心之一般考察——〉，《歷史學報(成大)》，13(1987)，頁155-208；葛兆光，《道教與中國文化》(上海：上海人民出版社，1987)，頁78-132；王家祐，〈張陵五斗米道與西南民族〉，收入氏著，《道教論稿》(成

在近代中國社會中巫覡與道士已很難加以分別[6]。

不過，巫覡及其信仰，其實不曾因爲被道教或其他宗教所吸收而從中國社會中消失[7]。早期的道教文獻也顯示，六朝的道士一再聲明自己和巫覡是兩種不同的宗教人物，並且屢屢攻擊巫覡的信仰[8]。因此，在這個時期，巫覡和道士的信仰似乎還是兩種互有差異的宗教傳統。總

（續）

都：巴蜀書社，1987），頁151-166；福永光司，《道教思想史研究》（東京：岩波書店，1987），頁437-454；任繼愈主編，《中國道教史》，（上海：上海人民出版社，1990），頁8-10；張繼禹，《天師道史略》（北京：華文出版社，1990），頁4-31；酒井忠夫、福井文雅，〈什麼是道教〉，收入福井康順等監修，朱越利譯，《道教·第一卷》（上海：上海古籍出版社，1990），頁1-24；金正耀，《道教與科學》（台北：曉園出版社，1994），頁18-28；劉鋒，《道教的起源與形成》（台北：文津出版社，1994），頁87-110；卿希泰、唐大潮，《道教史》（北京：中國社會科學出版社，1994），頁15-34；卿希泰主編，《中國道教一》（上海：知識出版社，1994），頁8-15；卿希泰主編，《中華道教簡史》（台北：中華道統出版社，1996），頁13-32；黃海德、李剛，《中華道教寶典》（台北：中華道統出版社，1995），頁2；Peter Nickerson, "Introduction" to *The Great Petition for Sepulchral Plaints*, in Stephen R. Bokenkamp, *Early Daoist Scriptures* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), pp. 230-260；柳存仁，〈道教是什麼？〉，收入氏著，《和風堂新文集》（台北：新文豐出版公司，1997），頁221-239。

6 有些學者在其論著中，甚至將道士和巫覡混為一談，詳見J. J. M. de Groot, *The Religious System of China*(Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1892-1910), vol. 6, pp. 1243-1268; M. Eliade, *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy*, trans. by Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), pp. 447-461; Kristofer Schipper, *Taoist Body*, trans. by Karen C. Duval(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), p. 6; M. Arthur Gump, "Re-visioning Shamanism," in Ruth-Inge Heinze ed., *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Study of Shamanism* (California: Independent Scholars of Asia, 1985), pp. 1-24, esp. pp. 14-22.

7 詳見Holmes Welch, *Taoism: The Parting of the Way*, revised edition(1957; Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), pp. 100-101.

8 詳見Rolf A. Stein, "Religious Taoism and Popular Religion from the Second to Seventh Centuries," pp. 53-81；羊華榮，〈道教與巫教之爭〉，頁35-42；林富士，〈試論《太平經》的疾病觀念〉，《中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊》，62:2(1993)，頁225-263；Chi-tim Lai, "The Opposition of Celestial-Master Taoism to Popular Cults during the Six Dynasties," pp. 1-20.

之，我們必須詳細的考察他們的宗教信仰和宗教活動，才能夠判斷這兩個宗教傳統是否真的在六朝時期已經合而爲一。

貳、信仰對象

首先，就信仰的對象來說，從先秦到兩漢時期，巫者所崇拜的鬼神大致不出《周禮・大宗伯》所說的「天神」(包括：昊天、上帝、日、月、星辰、司中、司命、風雨)、「地祇」(包括：社、稷、五祀、五嶽、山、川、林、澤、四方、百物)和「人鬼」[9]。其中，以「天神」和「地祇」(尤其是社神和山川之神)最受重視。

到了六朝時期，這樣的鬼神世界有了一些變化。

首先，或許是受到佛教的影響，死後世界的圖像遠比兩漢時期清晰，「地下主」和「冥官」的信仰日漸受到重視[10]。其次，或許是受到道教的影響，巫者也以「仙人」做爲崇拜的對象[11]。不過，最重要的改

9 詳見《周禮》[十三經注疏本](台北：藝文印書館，1981年翻印)，卷18，〈春官・大宗伯〉，頁270-274。

10 關於兩漢至六朝、隋唐時期中國死後世界觀的變化，參見前野直彬，〈冥界遊行〉，《中國文學報》，14(1961)，頁38-57；15(1961)，頁33-48；吳榮曾，〈鎮墓文中所見到的東漢道巫關係〉，頁56-63；Anna Seidel, "Traces of Han Religion in Funeral Texts Found in Tombs," 收入秋月觀暎編，《道教と宗教文化》(東京：平河出版社，1987)，頁21-57; Yü Ying-shih, " 'O Soul, Come Back!', A Study in the Changing Conceptions of the Soul and Afterlife in Pre-Buddhist China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 47:2(Dec. 1987), pp. 363-395; Stephen F. Teiser, "Having Once Died and Returned to Life: Representations of Hell in Medieval China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 48:2(1988), pp. 433-464; Robert F. Campany, "Return-From-Death Narratives in Early Medieval China," *Journal of Chinese Religions*, 18(Fall, 1990), pp. 91-125; Stephen F. Teiser, "The Growth of Purgatory," in Patricia B. Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory eds., *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*(Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1993).

11 例如，當時流行於江南地區的巫者祭神樂曲〈神弦歌〉中，不僅有「仙人」、

變還是在於山川之神的「人格化」以及厲鬼信仰的興盛。

一、山川之神

山川(包括社)神，從先秦以來便長期受到巫者的崇信，而且一直被視爲「自然界」本身的一種神奇力量，和人所轉化而成的鬼神並不相同。但從東漢時起，這些神祇便逐漸有「人格化」的趨勢。到了六朝時期，更紛紛以人的面貌出現。當時，在江南一帶有名的山川神有：會稽山神、廬山神、荊山神、石印三郎、苧羅山神、巢湖神、宮亭湖神、赤山湖神、嬌女神、白石郎君、東海神、南海神，以及當地一些較大的河流之神[12]。

二、厲鬼

其次，所謂的「厲鬼」，是指「非自然」死亡(橫死、冤死、自殺、刑殺、刀兵傷死)和「非正常」死亡(沒有安葬、沒有被人奉祀)的鬼魂。

這種鬼魂，由於無人奉祀，或是遭受冤屈或慘痛的意外災害而死，無法在「死後世界」獲得安息，因此，他們往往會回到活人的世界，以威嚇和恐怖的手段，尋求飲食和供養，或是復仇、洩恨，以致造成各種災害，其中又以疾病或瘟疫最爲常見。

要平息他們所造成的災害，主要的方法不外「祭」和「禳」，也就是透過祭祀尋求人鬼之間的和解，或是以「禳除」的手段徹底消滅厲

(續)

「神仙」之語，所歌詠的神靈之中更有道教的仙人蘇林和趙尊(趙道隱)；詳見王運熙，〈神弦歌考〉，收入氏著，《六朝樂府與民歌》(上海：古典文學出版社，1957)，頁167-181。

12 詳見Fu-shih Lin, "Chinese Shamans and Shamanism in the Chiang-nan Area During the Six Dynasties Period(3rd-6th Century A.D.)," Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University(Princeton, 1994), 第四章中有關「自然神」(Deities of Nature)的部分。

鬼。因此，從先秦以來，便有所謂的「祭厲」和「大儺」(逐疫)這一類的儀式和習俗[13]。不過，要到六朝時期，他們才普遍的成爲巫者崇奉的對象。

以江南地區來說，當時受人崇祀的「厲鬼」，忠貞而被殺害的有：春秋時期越國的文種和吳國的伍子胥、東漢末年袁紹的臣下田豐、三國時期魏國的大將鄧艾；因叛亂或戰敗而自殺或被殺的有：楚漢相爭時的項羽和韓信、兩漢之際的王莽、三國時期魏國的鍾士季、東晉時期的蘇峻；因追捕盜賊，不幸被殺、因公殉職的有：東漢末年的蔣子文[14]。另外，還有幾位女性的厲鬼，比較有名的有：被婆婆虐待而自殺的丁姑、被丈夫殺害的梅姑、被大太太(大婦)凌虐而自殺的小妾紫姑、以及未嫁而亡的「姑娘」蔣姑[15]。

這些有名的「厲鬼」，大多因死後顯靈，降禍或賜福於人而獲得注意，民眾因而替他們建立祠廟，予以奉祀。而他們和信徒之間的溝通大多透過巫者，祠廟和祭儀也由巫者掌管。其中，地位最爲崇高的是蔣子文。

蔣子文原本只是一名武職的地方官吏，在東漢末年任職於秣陵地區(現在的南京附近)，因追捕盜賊而被殺害於鍾山附近。後來，透過巫者要求百姓替他「立祠」，請求政府給予封號，並數度顯靈，降下災禍(瘟疫、火災)，因而被吳國君主孫權在西元211年左右封爲中都侯。從

13 詳見林富士，《漢代的巫者》，頁62-63；林富士，《孤魂與鬼雄的世界——北臺灣的厲鬼信仰》(台北：台北縣立文化中心，1995)，頁16-17、203-216。

14 詳見宮川尚志，《六朝史研究・宗教篇》，頁366-390；391-414；李豐楙，〈《道藏》所收早期道教的瘟疫觀——以《女青鬼律》及《洞淵神咒經》系為主〉，《中央研究院中國文哲研究所集刊》3(1993)，頁417-454；林富士，〈中國六朝時期的蔣子文信仰〉，收入傅飛嵐(Franciscus Verellen)、林富士編，《遺跡崇拜與聖者崇拜》(台北：允晨，2000)，頁163-204

15 詳見林富士，〈六朝時期民間社會所祀「女性人鬼」初探〉，《新史學》7：4(1996)，頁95-117。

此之後，在巫者和一些地方官吏的推動之下，信徒逐漸增加，祠廟也遍佈江南各地。六朝有不少皇帝都是他的信徒，並逐漸提昇他的地位，先是封侯，接著封王，最後在西元501年封他爲「靈帝」，使他成爲民間信仰中地位最高的一位神明[16]。

事實上，從六朝時期之後，這一類的厲鬼，始終在中國的巫覡信仰中佔據最重要的地位，即使在現代的台灣也不例外[17]。

三、道士的態度

對於巫者所崇拜的這些鬼神，道教基本上抱持著排斥和貶抑的態度。

例如，南朝時期著名的道士陸修靜(406-477AD)便主張，一般民眾不應該祭祀天、地、山川之神，只能祭拜自己的先人(祖先)和社神(土地神)、灶神。至於伍子胥、項羽、蔣子文這一類的「厲鬼」則被稱之爲「敗軍死將」、「亂軍死兵」、「邪神」、「邪鬼」，嚴禁祭拜[18]。有一些道教經典(如《太上洞淵神咒經》和《三天內解經》)更將當時瘟疫流行的原因歸咎於這些「厲鬼」作祟[19]。

至於山川之神，尤其是山神，也被道教視爲災禍的來源。例如，兩晉之際重要的道士葛洪(fl. 317-350AD)，在《抱朴子・內篇・登涉》中詳述「登山」、「入山」的各種危險時，便提到「山神」會令人生病、驚怖、不安、迷惑、狂走、墮落坑谷、被落石所擊、被虎狼毒蟲所傷

16 詳見林富士，〈中國六朝時期的蔣子文信仰〉，頁163-204。

17 詳見林富士，《孤魂與鬼雄的世界——北臺灣的厲鬼信仰》。

18 詳見陸修靜(406-477 AD)，《陸先生道門科略》〔《正統道藏》，第41冊，no. 761〕(台北：新文豐出版公司，1977年翻印)，頁1上-1下。按：本文所引道經基本上都出自新文豐出版公司據上海涵芬樓印本翻印之《正統道藏》，道經的編號係涵芬樓印本原有之冊號。

19 參見李豐楙，〈《道藏》所收早期道教的瘟疫觀——以《女青鬼律》及《洞淵神咒經》系為主〉，頁417-454。

20。

總之，巫者所崇拜的這些鬼神，對於道教來說，都是邪惡的神靈，都是必須加以禳除、斬滅的對象，或是可以被道士役使、操控的低級神明。道士認爲，只有上天和道教的仙真（由人修煉而成）才是真神、正神，才有無上的權威和力量，才值得人民崇拜[21]。僅就這一點來說，便很難將巫覡和道教視爲同一種宗教信仰。

叁、儀式特質

對於自己所信仰的鬼神，巫者都會有一套完整的禮拜儀式。一般來說，巫者會替其神明刻畫或雕塑神像，建立祠廟，並且舉行祭祀活動，以動物犧牲獻祭，以樂舞降神、娛神。

一、神像

無論是從文獻資料還是考古發掘來看，中國神像的起源都相當早，表現的方式也相當多樣。從遠古時期開始，工匠或巫師便在各種材質（包括：石器、陶器、銅器、漆器、木器、布帛等）和各式各樣的器物（包括：食器、酒器、炊具、武器、建築物、生活用品等）上雕刻或描繪鬼神的模樣[22]。

---

20 詳見葛洪(284-364AD)，《抱朴子內篇》〔王明，《抱朴子內篇校注》，增訂本〕(北京：中華書局，1985)，卷17，〈登涉〉，頁299。

21 關於道教的神仙觀念，論著頗多，在此無法一一列舉，通論性的作品，參見Henri Maspero, *Taoism and Chinese Religion*, trans. by Frank A. Kierman, Jr. (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1981), pp. 263-298, 309-430；胡孚琛，《魏晉神仙道教》(北京：人民出版社，1989)。

22 關於中國先秦至兩漢時期的鬼神形像或「神像」，詳見趙翼，《陔餘叢考》(河北：河北人民出版社，1990)，頁570-571；張光直，〈中國遠古時代儀式生活的若干資料〉，《中央研究院民族學研究所集刊》，9(1960)，頁253-268；

這些神像基本上都是以畫像或刻像為主，很少有雕塑作品。但是，到了六朝時期，巫者所崇信的鬼神卻大多以雕塑的方式表現形像，而且，在巫者及其信徒心目中，這種神像不只是神的一種「象徵」(symbol)，而是有神靈「寄寓」(possession)的「神體」，凡是加諸神像本身的毀損或污穢，都會直接傷害或污辱神明。任何人在神像面前的言行舉止，也都會一一為神明所聽聞、目睹[23]。

以蔣子文來說，不僅他本身有塑像，連他的女兒、部屬、兵馬也都有塑像或畫像。而且，他的神像還可以巡行各處，保護國家和信徒，並接受信徒的供養和膜拜。事實上，在蔣子文信仰由建康(南京)向其他地區傳播、擴散的過程中，他的神像具有無比的重要性。

除了蔣子文之外，當時巫者所崇信的鬼神之中，如青溪小姑(蔣姑)、廬山君、宮亭湖神等，也都有神像[24]。

總之，六朝的巫覡對於鬼神的信仰，主要的表現方式之一便是「偶像崇拜」，而這正是早期道教信仰所欠缺的特質。

例如，根據唐代法琳《辯正論》的記載，在南北朝(420-589AD)以

(續)

陳槃，〈租製木偶〉，收入氏著，《漢晉遺簡識小七種》(台北：中央研究院歷史語言研究所，1975)，頁56下-70上；Michael Loewe, *Ways to Paradise: The Chinese Quest for Immortality* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1979)；Wang Zhongshu, *Han Civilization*, trans. by K. C. Chang and Collaborators(New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982)；張光直，《中國青銅時代》(台北：聯經，1983)，頁327-354，355-387；陳履生，《神畫主神研究》(北京：紫禁城出版社，1987)；張光直，《中國青銅時代，第二集》(台北：聯經，1990)，頁91-97，99-111；張光直，〈仰韶文化的巫覡文化〉，《中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊》，64：3(1993)，頁611-625；林富士，《漢代的巫者》，頁100-105。

23 詳見Fu-shih Lin, "Chinese Shamans and Shamanism in the Chiang-nan Area During the Six Dynasties Period(3rd-6th Century A.D.),"第三章中討論「神像」(Images of Spirits)的部分。

24 同上。

前，道教認爲「道無形質」，因此不主張「造像」，連其主神「元始天尊」都沒有形像，南朝著名的道士陶弘景(452-536AD)在茅山時曾設立佛、道二堂，其中，「佛堂有像，道堂無像」。道教要到隋唐時期(581-907AD)，才在佛教及巫覡的影響之下，開始大量創製自己的神像[25]。事實上，南朝的道士顧歡(430-493AD)也坦承，「立像」是佛教和巫覡信仰的共同特質，卻不是道教信仰的核心[26]。

二、祠廟

由於巫者將神像視爲神明的本體，因此，便必須長期供奉神像。

一般來說，巫者和其信徒會將神像擺放在家中的廳堂，安置在「神座」上，以便隨時進行祈禱、祭祀這一類的儀式活動。但是，一些擁有眾多信徒的神明，往往還有專屬的祠廟。事實上，從酈道元(469？-572 AD)《水經注》的記載來看，當時中國境內到處都有各種神明的祠廟[27]。

當時和巫覡信仰特別有關的，或是由巫者掌管的祠廟，以江南地區來說，至少有：蔣子文廟(又叫蔣侯祠、蔣帝廟)、清溪廟、石印三郎祠、宮亭廟、孤石廟、焦湖(巢湖)廟、梅姑廟、戴侯祠等[28]。

總之，從先秦時期以來，祠廟可以說一直是巫覡信仰的主要標誌和發展基地，祠廟不僅是神明的棲息之處，也是巫者的聚集、託身場所，以及信徒朝聖、參拜和舉行各種宗教儀式的公共空間。香火鼎盛的祠廟

25 詳見陳國符，〈道教形像考原〉，收入氏著，《道藏源流考》，頁268-269。

26 詳見蕭子顯(489-537 AD)，《南齊書》(北京：中華書局，1972)，卷54，〈高逸列傳〉，頁934。

27 詳見宮川尚志，〈水經注に見えた祠廟〉，收入氏著，《六朝史研究・宗教篇》，頁366-390。

28 詳見Fu-shih Lin, "Chinese Shamans and Shamanism in the Chiang-nan Area During the Six Dynasties Period (3rd-6th Century A.D.)," 第三章中討論「祠廟」(Shrines)的部分。

往往可以積累相當多的財富。因此，中國歷代政府打擊巫覡信仰時，最常採取的手段就是拆毀其祠廟[29]。日本殖民政府在統治台灣期間(1895-1945)也曾採取類似的做法[30]。

相對於巫者的祠廟，早期的道士也會建立道館(道觀)。但是，道館主要是道士及其弟子修道、生活的場所，不是神明或仙真的寓所[31]。而且，早期的道士對於巫者的祠廟也抱持著強烈的敵意。例如，東漢末年的曹操曾經因爲下令拆毀遍佈於山東地區的「城陽景王祠」，而被早期的道教團體「太平道」視爲「同道」[32]。其次，一些道派的領袖人物也都主張，必須毀壞巫者的祠廟，防止廟中的「淫昏之鬼」、「血食之神」危害百姓、擾亂人民。有些經典甚至還記載了撤除祠廟、防止巫者神靈報復的方法和法術[33]。

三、酒肉與犧牲

巫者通常是透過頻繁的祭祀，表示他們對於鬼神的崇拜和禮敬，或是祈求鬼神的庇佑以來福去禍，因此，儒者和政府官員往往以「淫祀」

---

29 參見J. J. M. de Groot, *The Religious System of China*, vol. 6, pp. 1233-1242；Fu-shih Lin, "Chinese Shamans and Shamanism in the Chiang-nan Area During the Six Dynasties Period(3rd-6th Century A.D.)," 第六章中討論「士大夫及政府」(Literati Officals and State Power)的部分。

30 詳見陳玲蓉，《日據時期神道統制下的臺灣宗教政策》(台北：自立晚報社，1992)；蔡錦堂，《日本帝國主義下台灣の宗教政策》(東京：同成社，1994)。

31 參見陳國符，〈道館考原〉，收入氏著，《道藏源流考》，頁266-268。

32 詳見陳壽(233-297AD)，《三國志》(北京：中華書局，1959)，卷1，〈武帝紀〉，頁4，10，裴松之注引《魏書》。

33 詳見葛洪，《抱朴子內篇》，卷17，〈登涉〉，頁313；陸修靜，《陸先生道門科略》，頁1上-2下；陶弘景(456-536AD)，《登眞隱訣》(《正統道藏》，第11冊，no. 193)，卷下，頁11下-12上，21下；《赤松子章曆》(《正統道藏》，第18冊，no. 335-336)，卷2，頁21下。

稱之。

巫者在舉行祭祀儀式的時候，主要的活動就是宰殺牲畜(牛、羊、豬、雞、鴨等)，將血、肉獻給鬼神，同時也用酒祭神。因此，他們的祭典往往被描述爲「烹殺六畜，酌祭邪鬼」、「宰殺三牲、酒肉是求」，或是「血食」之祀[34]。

以動物爲犧牲、以酒肉祭神，是中國社會相當古老的宗教傳統，六朝的巫覡信仰只是延續這樣的傳統而已，但在當時卻引來佛、道二教嚴厲的批判。佛教主要是以「殺生」爲罪名指控巫者[35]。道教之中，雖然也有人以「不飲酒」和「不殺生」爲戒律，但是，他們反對巫者「血食」和「酒肉」之祀的理由，主要還是基於「經濟」上的考量。他們認爲，這樣的祭祀活動，耗費人民太多財物，而且，巫者所崇拜的神明都是低級、無能的「邪鬼」，因此，不僅無法得到福佑，還會損失錢財，招來禍害[36]。

四、絃歌與鼓舞

巫者的祭祀活動中另一個特色就是充斥著音樂和舞蹈，文獻一般稱之爲「絃歌」、「鼓舞」。據說，先秦時期楚辭的「九歌」、六朝時期流行於江南一帶的「神絃歌」，都是巫者在祭祀儀式中吟唱的歌曲，部

---

34 詳見陳國符，〈南北朝天師道考長編〉，收入氏著，《道藏源流考》，頁311-312。

35 詳見Fu-shih Lin, "Chinese Shamans and Shamanism in the Chiang-nan Area During the Six Dynasties Period(3rd-6th Century A.D.)," 第六章中討論「佛教」(Buddhism)的部分。

36 詳見王明，《太平經合校》(北京：中華書局，1979)，庚部，卷114，〈病歸天有費訣〉，頁619-612；葛洪，《抱朴子內篇》，卷9，〈道意〉，頁170-176；陸修靜，《陸先生道門科略》，頁1上-2下；徐氏，《三天內解經》(《正統道藏》，第48冊，no. 876)，卷上，頁1下-2上。

分內容還描述了巫者演奏樂器、載歌載舞的場景[37]。

事實上，巫者應該是中國古代社會中主要的歌者、舞者和音樂家。東漢許慎(d. 120? AD)在《說文解字》中以「以舞降神者」解釋「巫」這個字的字義，便充分說明了巫者在這方面的技能[38]。

和巫者有關的文獻記載也大多會提及他們在音樂方面的才華。例如，西晉末年在會稽永興一帶，有兩名女巫叫做章丹和陳珠(fl. 280 AD)，便以能歌善舞聞名，而且能「撞鐘擊鼓，間以絲竹」，換句話說，她們還精通各種樂器[39]。至於中國巫者常用的樂器，以絃樂器來說，至少有琴(一絃與多絃)、胡琴、瑟和琵琶。吹奏樂器有竽、簫和牛角。敲擊樂器則有鼓、鈴、鐸、鐘、鐃和鑼[40]。

總之，音樂(樂舞)在中國巫者的儀式中具有無比的重要性。除了用來娛樂鬼神並娛樂參與祭典的民眾之外，巫者有時候也用樂舞(尤其是樂器)驅除妖邪、治療疾病，或是「召降」(招致)鬼神。事實上，樂舞可以說是中國巫者用來溝通鬼神的主要工具之一[41]。

對於巫者的樂舞，道教並未明說有何不對或不好，只是將它視為巫者祭祀儀式的一部分，一併加以否定。事實上，到了隋唐時期，道教也開始大力發展自己的音樂傳統，而較為重要的「步虛」和「音誦」則可以追溯到南北朝時期。但是，早期道教只使用鐘磬，樂器的種類顯得相

---

37 詳見王運熙，〈神弦歌考〉，頁167-181；Donald Holzman, "Songs for the Gods: The Poetry of Popular Religion in Fifth-Century China," *Asia Major*, third series, 3:1 (1990), pp. 1-19.

38 詳見林富士，〈「巫叩元絃」考釋——兼論音樂與中國的巫覡儀式之關係〉，《新史學》，7：3(1996)，頁195-218。

39 詳見房玄齡等，《晉書》(北京：中華書局，1974)，卷94，〈隱逸列傳〉，頁2428-2429。

40 詳見林富士，〈巫覡與樂舞〉，收入氏著，《小歷史：歷史的邊陲》(台北：三民書局，2000)，頁14-25。

41 詳見林富士，〈「巫叩元絃」考釋——兼論音樂與中國的巫覡儀式之關係〉，頁195-218。

當貧乏，其豐富性比不上巫覡音樂[42]。

肆、通神方式

巫者在宗教事務方面的主要功能之一就是擔任人和鬼神之間的媒介，因此，也有人稱之爲「靈媒」(medium)。然而，各個時代、各個地方的巫者，和鬼神交通的方式並不盡相同。以傳統中國社會和近、現代的台灣社會來說，基本上是以所謂的「降神」或「附身」(possession)爲主要的方式，不過，也有不少巫者是以所謂的「視鬼」或「見鬼」(seeing)爲主。另外，也有一些巫者是以所謂的「出神」或「魂遊」(ecstasy)的方式和鬼神世界接觸。

一、降神或附身

所謂的「降神」(或「下神」)就是「招降」鬼神，使祂們依附或憑依在巫者的身上，開口說話，和人直接溝通，這是中國巫者最常用的通神方式。事實上，《國語・楚語》、《漢書・郊祀志》和《說文解字》也都以「降神」界定「巫」字的含義。而無論是先秦、秦漢，還是六朝時期的巫者，都具有這種稟賦和技能[43]。當代福建、東南亞和台灣一帶的華人社會中，所謂的「童乩」也都是以讓神明「附身」的方式擔任人神之間的媒介[44]。

對於巫者的這種通神方式，道教雖然並不否認其真實性，卻相當貶抑這種行爲。有一些經典(如《真誥》、《老君音誦誡經》)便說，道教的仙真極少、極不願降附在人身上，因爲一般人(包括巫者)的身體都充

42 詳見陳國符，〈道樂考略稿〉，收入氏著，《道藏源流考》，頁291-307。

43 詳見林富士，《漢代的巫者》，頁22-25。

44 詳見林富士，《孤魂與鬼雄的世界》，頁159-172。

斥著「塵濁」和「污穢」[45]。

道士雖然也有「身中神」[46]和「尸蟲」[47]的信仰，在修煉「存神」之類的法術時，也會召喚神靈進入自己的身體以守衛魂魄、精神或斬殺邪鬼、治療疾病[48]。但是，絕大多數的道士絕不會任由自己的身體被任何一個神靈佔據，成爲其靈媒。通常，道士將這種被鬼神「附身」的現象視爲「中邪」、「鬼祟」之病，必須加以治療[49]。

總而言之，對於早期的道士而言，「附身」並不是他們和仙真、神靈交通的「正常」方式。道士雖然也能擔任人神之間的媒介，但是，他們和鬼神的交通方式，基本上是透過所謂的「上章」，形式相當類似傳統中國的政府官員以章、表這類的文書向皇帝上奏[50]。在六朝的巫覡信

---

45 詳見陶弘景編，《眞誥》〔《正統道藏》，第35冊，no. 637-640〕，卷1，〈運象篇〉，頁7下-9下；寇謙之，《老君音誦誡經》〔《正統道藏》，第30冊，no. 562〕，頁5下-6上

46 關於道教「身中神」的概念，參見王明，〈黃庭經考〉，收入氏著，《道教和道家思想研究》（重慶：中國社會科學出版社，1984），頁324-371；龔鵬程，〈《黃庭經》論〉，收入氏著，《道教新論》（嘉義：南華管理學院，1998），頁71-152

47 關於道教的「三尸」概念和相關的信仰，詳見窪德忠，《庚申信仰の研究》（東京：原書房，1980）；宮川尚志，〈道教的身體論における尸蟲と魂魄〉，收入內藤幹治編，《中國的人生觀・世界觀》（東京：東方書店，1994），頁259-271。

48 詳見Livia Kohn, "Guarding the One: Concentrative Medition in Taoism," Isabelle Robinet, "Visualization and Ecstatic Flight in Shangqing Taoism," in Livia Kohn ed., *Taoist Meditation and Longevity Techniques*（Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, The University of Michigan, 1989）, pp. 125-158, 159-192; Isabelle Robinet, *Taoist Meditation: The Mao-shan Tradition of Graet Purity*, trans. by Julian F. Pas and Norman J. Girardot（New York: State University of New York Press, 1993）.

49 詳見孫思邈，《備急千金要方》（台北：宏業書局，1987），卷17，〈肺臟〉，頁317-321；卷24，〈解毒并雜治〉，頁436-439。

50 關於六朝道教的「上章」儀式，參見陳國符，《道藏源流考》，頁360-365；丸山宏，〈上章儀禮より見たる正一道教の特色——治病の章を中心としへ——〉，《佛教史學研究》，30：2（1987），頁56-84

仰中幾乎沒有這樣的「文書」作業。

二、視鬼或見鬼

三國時期的韋昭在注《國語・楚語》的時候，曾以「見鬼者」定義「巫覡」，因爲，「覡」字古音讀爲「擊」，有「目擊」之意。這個定義似乎也反映出當時有相當多的巫者是以「目視」、「目擊」的方式接觸鬼神的世界。事實上，兩漢和六朝的文獻中，曾提到所謂的「見鬼人」、「見鬼者」、「視鬼者」，史書和志怪之類的文獻中也有一些「見鬼」的故事[51]。

當然，並不是所有曾經或能夠「見鬼」的人都是巫覡，不過，根據當時人的看法，「見鬼」是巫覡的「天賦」能力。巫覡不需要經過修煉或使用特別的法術、藥物，自然就能目睹鬼神的形貌、動作、言談，進而和祂們溝通、酬酢。因此，這也成爲巫者和鬼神交通的主要方式之一[52]。

早期的道士(如葛洪)對於巫者擁有這種「見鬼」的稟賦，似乎深信不疑，也相信人可以用這種方式和鬼神交通。因此，道教也發展出一套所謂的「見鬼之術」。

根據《抱朴子》的說法，這種法術主要是爲了幫助沒有「見鬼」稟賦的人，使他們可以看見鬼神，至於具體的操作方式又可以分成兩種。一種是利用符咒令鬼神「現形」，另一種則是在人身上施行符咒、藥物或法術，使他們暫時性的具有見鬼的能力[53]。

因此，道教的「見鬼」之術基本上是一種後天的、外加的能力，而

51 詳見林富士，《漢代的巫者》，頁52-53；Fu-shih Lin, "Chinese Shamans and Shamanism in the Chiang-nan Area During the Six Dynasties Period(3rd-6th Century A.D.)," 第五章中討論「見鬼」(Seeing the Spirits)的部分。

52 同上。

53 詳見葛洪，《抱朴子內篇》，卷2，〈論仙〉，頁20。

且大多只具有短暫的效力。而巫覡的見鬼能力則是天生的、內在的稟賦，除了非常特別的情形之外，大多不會喪失。不過，不可否認的是，早期道士之中，也有少數人(如楊羲)具有這種「見鬼」的天賦，而且利用這種才能，擔任道教仙真和其信徒之間的媒介[54]。

三、出神或魂遊

大致來說，傳統中國社會認為，人的生命是由形體和魂魄(精神)所組成，魂魄會在夢中或某些特殊的狀況之下(如重病、昏迷)，暫時離開形體，甚至可以進入另一個世界(死後世界或鬼神世界)，這種情形，通常又稱之為神遊或魂遊[55]。

一般人無法自主的決定是否要「魂遊」，或是在魂遊的狀態下要到什麼地方去。但是，根據先秦時期的一些神話和文獻資料來看，巫者似乎擁有隨意「上天入地」的能力。換句話說，巫者可以自主的操控自己的魂、神，進出形體，出入人間和鬼神世界，擔任人神之間的媒介[56]。

不過，在兩漢和六朝的巫者之中，我們卻很少看到巫者以「魂遊」的方式交通鬼神，南朝時期的女巫嚴道育(fl. 452 AD)大概是僅有的一

54 最有名的道士是上清經派的楊羲(330-380AD)。關於楊羲的生平及其和上清經系的關係，參見陳國符，《道藏源流考》，頁32-34；李養正，〈楊羲與《上清大洞真經》〉，《中國道教》，4(1987)，頁49-52；劉怡君，〈六朝上清經系的濟度思想——以楊許時期為主的考察〉，碩士論文(台北：輔仁大學宗教學研究所，1987)；劉琳，〈楊羲與許謐父子造作上清經考〉，《中國文化》，8(1993)，頁104-110。

55 詳見余英時，〈中國古代死後世界觀的演變〉，收入氏著，《中國思想傳統的現代詮釋》(台北：聯經，1987)，頁123-144；杜正勝，〈形體、精氣與魂魄：中國傳統對人認識的形成〉，《新史學》2：3(1991)，頁1-65。Fu-shih Lin, "Religious Taoism and Dreams: An Analysis of the Dream-data Collected in the *Yün-chi ch'i-ch'ien*," *Cahier d'Extrême-Asie*, 8(1995), pp. 95-112.

56 參見張光直，〈商代的巫與巫術〉，收入氏著，《中國青銅時代，第二集》，頁41-65。

個例子[57]。然而，以台灣的情形來說，童乩（或尪姨）仍會替人舉行「關落陰」的儀式，也就是童乩讓自己的魂神進入陰間、地府，探視鬼魂，替其親屬傳達信息，或將鬼魂帶回陽間，附身在童乩身上，和其親人會面、交談[58]。

相對而言，從道教的經典和文學作品（尤其是遊仙詩）來看，早期的道士似乎相當精通「魂遊」的技能，能使自己的魂神暫時離體，和仙真接遇，或是到仙境遊歷[59]。就此來說，早期的道士似乎很像那些以「魂遊」（ecstasy）爲主要特質的北亞和東北亞的薩滿（shaman）。

總之，六朝的巫者和道士，所採用的交通鬼神的方式，雖然有一些共同或類似的地方，但是，當時的巫者畢竟是以「附身」和「見鬼」爲主，而道士則仰賴「魂遊」。而且，採用這種交通鬼神的方式時，巫者主要是爲了擔任人神之間的媒介，而道士則通常是爲了自己要和仙真或仙界有所接觸[60]。當道士要扮演媒介者角色的時候，他們主要是使用

57 詳見沈約（441-513AD），《宋書》（北京：中華書局，1974），卷99，〈二凶列傳〉，頁2424-2439。

58 詳見吳瀛濤，〈台灣的降神術——關於觀童乩的迷信——〉，《台灣風物》，9：5,6（1959），頁25-27；劉枝萬，〈臺灣的靈媒——童乩——〉，《台灣風物》，31：1（1981），頁104-115；國分直一，〈台灣のシャマニズム——とくに童乩の落嶽探宮をめぐって〉，收入氏著，《壺を祀る村：台灣民俗誌》（東京：法政大學出版局，1981）；謝世忠，〈試論中國民俗宗教中之「通神者」與「通鬼者」的性別優勢〉，《思與言》，23：5（1986），頁511-518；佐佐木伸一，〈牽亡を行なう女性達——台灣南部のシャーマン的職能者に關する事例報告〉，《大阪明淨女子短期大學紀要》，5（1990），頁171-188；劉枝萬，〈台灣のシャマニズム〉，收入氏著，《台灣の道教と民間信仰》（東京：風響社，1994），頁143-172；張開基，《台灣首席靈媒與牽亡魂》（台北：作者自印，1995）；張開基，《台灣首席靈媒：花蓮「石壁部堂」牽亡法會現場報導與探索》（台北：新潮社，2000）。

59 詳見李豐楙，《憂與遊：六朝隋唐遊仙詩論集》（台北：臺灣學生書局，1996），頁1-292。

60 詳見Henri Maspero, *Taoism and Chinese Religion*, pp. 263-298.

「文書」來和神靈溝通。

伍、結語

從六朝巫覡主要的信仰對象(厲鬼和山川之神)、儀式特質(祠廟、神像、血食、樂舞)和通神方式(附身、見鬼)來看，當時的巫覡信仰仍然和新興的道教信仰有相當大的差異，很難說兩者已經融混爲一個宗教傳統。

不過，由於道教的勢力日漸興盛，有一部份巫者或其信徒也轉而信仰道教[61]，但在「改信」(conversion)之後，他們似乎不曾完全拋棄巫覡的宗教習慣[62]，因此，早期道教的信仰和儀式中的確夾雜了一些巫覡信仰的成分。而道士爲了搶奪巫覡的信徒，事實上也大量接受巫者的一些巫術(如符咒)和信仰(如疾病由鬼神作祟所致的觀念)[63]，並提供其信

---

61 如許映(許邁，fl. ca. 321-379 AD)、范伯慈、華僑、斯神、龍稚、周子良家族等。詳見《眞誥》，卷4，〈運象篇〉，頁9上-12下；卷14，〈稽神樞〉，頁11下-12上；馬樞(fl. 557-589 AD)，《道學傳》(陳國符輯，《道學傳輯佚》，收入氏著，《道藏源流考》，頁454-504)，卷4，〈杜炅〉，頁461；《紫陽眞人內傳》(《正統道藏》，第9冊，no. 153)，〈周裴二眞敘〉，頁18上-19下；陶弘景，《周氏冥通記》(《正統道藏》，第9冊，no. 152)，卷1，頁1上-7下，13上。

62 例如，以巫入道的斯神，便長年收藏其「法服」：詳見《道學傳》，卷4，〈杜炅〉，頁461。其次，原本屬於帛家道或「俗家」(巫覡)信徒的丹陽許氏家族，雖然「改信」天師道，又信奉「上清經派」，但在日常生活中，仍不改一些舊有的「習慣」(如以白犬祭土地神、吃狗肉等)：詳見《眞誥》，卷7，〈甄命授〉，頁11下-12上。

63 詳見林富士，〈試論《太平經》的疾病觀念〉，頁225-263；林富士，〈中國六朝時期的巫覡與醫療〉，《中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊》，70：1(1999)，頁1-48；林富士，〈中國早期道士的醫療活動及其醫術考釋：以漢魏晉南北朝時期的「傳記」資料為主的初步探討〉，《中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊》，73：1(2002)，頁43-118

徒一些類似巫者的宗教服務(如：祈禱、驅邪、治病、喪葬等)。[64]

另一方面，巫者爲了對抗道教，事實上也進行了自我改造，吸收了道教的神仙信仰，有些巫者還修習道教的養生術(服食)，或在稱號、服飾方面模仿道士[65]。

在這種情形之下，六朝的巫覡信仰和道教信仰的確有一些交疊之處，彼此的邊界也不是可以絕對畫分清楚。而佛教和道教之間也有類似的融混現象。不過，我們不能因而判定巫、道不分，也不能將佛、道視爲相同的一個宗教。

64 詳見陳國符，〈南北朝天師道考長編〉，頁311-369。

65 詳見《眞誥》，卷11，〈稽神樞〉，頁9下，15上-15下；沈約，《宋書》，卷99，〈二凶列傳〉，頁2424。

素食與中國佛教

康　樂
中央研究院歷史語言研究所研究員

一提起素食，自然就聯想到佛教，對中國人而言，所謂的「出家人」就是「持齋」的人，這是天經地義的事，除了濟公等少數傳說中的人物外，「酒肉和尚」一直到現在還是罵人的話。然而，佛教僧侶是否一定得吃素，實際上的情況似乎並非如此，除了中國佛教(以及直接從中國傳入的台灣佛教)外，其他的佛教，例如藏傳佛教、東南亞一帶的南傳佛教、日本佛教等等，並不忌諱吃葷。

其實，即使是中國佛教，僧侶的全面素食(禁斷酒肉)也是在佛教傳入中國將近五百年以後的事，而一手導演此一佛教史上劃時代事件的關鍵人物則是南朝的梁武帝(502-549)。梁武帝的動機何在？此一事件的歷史意義如何？這是本文主旨所在。

關鍵詞：素食，不殺生，新素食觀，身分，梁武帝，佛教，道教，喫菜事魔

一、肉食者鄙？

在〈潔淨、身分與素食〉一文裡[1]，筆者曾提到過，肉食對古代中國人而言算是「美食」，實際上也是較爲珍貴的食物，最直接的一個證據莫過於《論語》裡的一段記載：

> 子在齊聞韶，三月不知肉味，曰：「不圖為樂之至於斯也」。（《論語・述而第七》）

以「肉味」比擬音樂之美妙，肉食在當時中國人心目中的地位可想而知。此外，印度社會雖然崇尚素食，然而，除了大乘佛教此一系統外，印度佛教僧侶基本上並不忌諱肉食——只要是「淨肉」即可。因此，從印度傳入中國的佛教會轉變成一個如此堅持素食的宗教，顯然是件饒富趣味的事。

我們首先要答覆的一個問題是：中國人原先對素食（蔬食、菜食）是抱持怎樣的一種態度？在上述一文裡，筆者曾經提到中國人在居喪與齋戒的場合裡，是有素食的規定；此外，遇到饑荒時，統治者往往也會以素食的方式來表示對享受的暫時節制。因此，素食對古代中國人而言，幾乎就是「粗食」的同義辭[2]：

> 子曰：「飯疏食飲水，曲肱而枕之，樂亦在其中矣」（註：疏食，麤飯也）。（《論語集注・述而第七》）

---

1 《大陸雜誌》，102:1（2001），頁15-46。

2 凡草菜可食者通名為「疏」，本作「疏」，漢魏間始改為「蔬」。因此，不管是「蔬食」或「疏食」，皆為「素食」，根據《中文辭源》的解釋，則有「粗食」之義。此外，素食另有「尸位素餐」之義，不過，此義並非本文所要探討者，姑且置之不論。

> 丞相史曰：「孝莫大以天下一國養，次祿養，下以力。故王公人君，上也，卿大夫，次也。夫以家人言之，有賢子當路於世者，高堂邃宇，安車大馬，衣輕暖，食甘毳。無者，褐衣皮冠，窮居陋巷，有旦無暮，食蔬糲葷茹，膢臘而後見肉。老親之腹非唐園，唯菜是盛。夫蔬糲，乞者所不取，而子以養親，雖欲以禮，非其貴也」(《鹽鐵論校注・卷五・二十五孝養》，頁179)。

漢魏史書中所見「布衣蔬食」一辭，若非形容某人貧困，否則即描述其生活節儉：

> (東漢安帝)永初中，三輔遭羌寇，(竇)章避難東國，家於外黃。居貧，蓬户蔬食，躬勤孝養，然講讀不輟(《後漢書・竇章》，23，頁821)。
>
> (費)禕別傳曰：禕雅性謙素，家不積財。兒子皆令布衣素食，出入不從車騎，無異凡人(《三國志・蜀書・費禕》，44，頁1062)。

此外，當然也有因爲守喪時特別延長蔬食布衣的期間，從而博得留名青史的機會，只是服喪而蔬食本即中國古來禮法，這樣的蔬食自無新意可言：

> 孟陋字少孤，武昌人也。……陋少而貞立，清操絕倫，布衣蔬食，以文籍自娛，口不及世事，未曾交游，時或弋釣，孤興獨往，雖家人亦不知其所之也。喪母，毀瘠殆於滅性，不飲酒食肉十有餘年。親族迭謂之曰：「少孤！誰無父母？誰有父母！聖人制禮，令賢者俯就，不肖企及。若使毀性無嗣，更為不孝也。」陋感此言，然後從吉。由是名著海內(《晉書・孟

陋》，94，頁2442-3)。

《鹽鐵論》裡丞相史所說的：「夫蔬糲，乞者所不取」，或許誇張了些，古代中國人對素食沒有太大的好感，卻也是個不爭的事實。只是佛教的傳入卻逐漸扭轉了這個觀念。

二、不殺生戒的影響

法輪東轉之初，中國的僧人是否就採取了徹底的素食主義？答案似乎是否定的。推測寫成於東漢末年的牟子〈理惑篇〉雖然提到過「佛道以酒肉爲上誡」[3]，個別的僧人想來也有力行素食者，然而並沒有成爲整個僧伽的制度，否則後來的梁武帝就沒有必要大張旗鼓地厲行禁酒肉的戒令，而《高僧傳》裡也沒有必要將當時某個僧人的持久蔬食列爲一件特殊的行徑，慎重其事地記載下來[4]，就像今天的台灣大概不會有人想要特別去強調某個比丘或比丘尼「素食」一樣。

其實，由於入華傳法的僧侶來源複雜(地域上有西域、印度之分，宗派上則大小乘兼具)，所奉行的戒律自然也有不少出入。西元401年，

---

3 《大正新修大藏經・弘明集》，52：2102：1，頁6。

4 《高僧傳》與《續高僧傳》提到蔬食(或魚肉葷辛)者共有69處，其中62人在隋唐以前，隋唐則僅有7人，可見自梁武帝禁斷僧伽酒肉後，素食逐漸成為中國佛教僧團的一個傳統，故隋唐僧人素食已被視為當然而毋庸再特別記載(詳見下節)。

附帶說明一點的是，諏訪義純曾作過《高僧傳》裡(隋唐以前)素食者的統計表，他的數目是68人，與筆者的統計有些出入，這是由於對某些資料的解讀不同之故。根據諏訪義純的統計，素食者68人，占所有《高僧傳》僧侶數(497人)的13%弱，可見比率實在不高。此外，《比丘尼傳》裡素食者(自東晉至梁)，根據諏訪義純的統計共有28人，占32%。詳見諏訪義純，《中國中世佛教史研究》(東京，1988)，頁46-57。

翻譯大師鳩摩羅什入長安，秦主姚興賜予妓女十人，於是不住僧坊[5]。不管《高僧傳》裡提出的藉口是甚麼，「淫欲爲障道法」，佛陀當年列爲第一重戒(波羅夷)，犯者逐出教團。這是不管大小乘都須遵守的，連這個重戒都可以放棄，肉食與否似乎也不是那麼重要了[6]。

不過，佛教的傳入終究將不殺生的觀念介紹到中國來，雖然我們尚無法確定此一觀念落實到甚麼程度。只是，隨著大乘經典的陸續譯出，特別是「食肉傷大慈種」等一類理論不斷的引介和宣傳的結果，中國的佛教信徒、甚至一般民間社會也逐漸將「肉食」(血食)與「殺生」等同起來，雖然並不見得就此即全盤接受了素食的主張，然而傳統的蔬食一辭，卻也因此增加了另一層宗教性的意涵。魏晉以後的史書提到蔬食時，有時已與佛教的素食有關：

> 周續之字道祖，雁門廣武人也。……既而閑居讀老、易，入廬山事沙門釋慧遠。……以為身不可遣，餘累宜絕，遂終身不娶妻，布衣蔬食(《宋書・周續之》，93，頁2280)。
>
> 永明十一年(493)，上(武帝)不豫，……詔曰：「我識滅之後，……祭敬之典，本在因心，東鄰殺牛，不如西家禴祭。我靈上愼勿以牲為祭，唯設餅、茶飲、干飯、酒脯而已。天下貴賤，咸同此制。未山陵前，朔望設菜食」(《南齊書・武帝蹟》，3，頁61)。
>
> (到)溉家門雍睦，兄弟特相友愛。初與弟洽常共居一齋，洽卒後，便捨為寺，因斷腥羶，終身蔬食，別營小室，朝夕從僧徒

5 《大正新修大藏經・高僧傳》，50：2059：2，頁332。

6 鳩摩羅什之外，西元五世紀初活躍於河西走廊(北涼)的曇無讖行徑也差不多：始罽賓沙門曰曇無讖，東入鄯善，自云「能使鬼治病，令婦人多子」，與鄯善王妹曼頭陀林私通。發覺，亡奔涼州。蒙遜寵之，號曰「聖人」。曇無讖以男女交接之術教授婦人，蒙遜諸女、子婦皆往受法(《魏書》，99，頁2208)。

禮誦(《梁書・到溉》，40，頁569)。

類似的、自發且終身性的素食開始在中國出現，儘管其普遍性尚有待考察，而且可以上溯至何時也不得而知。除此之外，更爲普遍的或許是短期的齋戒，例如前一篇曾提到過的八關齋。東晉時郗超(336-377)的〈奉法要〉裡，對於佛教徒一般性的修齋也有詳細的說明：

已行五戒便修歲三月六齋。歲三齋者，正月一日至十五日，五月一日至十五日，九月一日至十五日。月六齋者，月八日、十四日、十五日、二十三日、二十九日、三十日。凡齋日皆當魚肉不御，迎中而食，既中之後，甘香美味一不得嘗，洗心念道歸命三尊，悔過自責行四等心，遠離房室不著六欲，不得鞭撻罵詈、乘駕牛馬、帶持兵仗，婦人則兼去香花脂粉之飾(《大正新修大藏經・弘明集》，52：2102：13，頁86)。

在齋戒期間，素食當然是最基本的要求。只是，這似乎還是屬於傳統舊有的齋戒性素食的範疇——即暫時地避免一切美好事物(包括美食)的誘惑。

然而，源自於印度不殺生戒的新素食觀還是在中國生根茁壯起來，殺生與肉食則開始被賦予負面的意義，只是，當時強調的重點似乎還是放在「不殺生」的理念。上引蕭齊武帝(483-493)的詔書裡所說的：「東鄰殺牛，不如西家禴祭，我靈上慎勿以牲爲祭」，著重的是「勿以牲爲祭」這句話；因此，雖然他也要求在未出殯前，朔望祭祀時必須供設菜食(素食)，然而平時供桌上陳設「酒脯(臘肉)」卻也無妨。《高僧傳》裡釋法度(436-500)的一則故事，同樣說明了當時佛教僧侶的態度：

釋法度，黃龍人，少出家……(劉)宋末遊于京師，高士齊郡明僧紹……隱居瑯琊之攝山。……及亡捨所居山為栖霞精舍，請

> (法)度居之，先有道士欲以寺地為館，住者輒死，及後為寺，猶多恐動，自(法)度居之群妖皆息。住經歲許，忽聞人馬鼓角之聲，俄見一人持名紙通(法)度曰：靳尚。(法)度前之，(靳)尚形甚都雅羽衛亦嚴。致敬已乃言：弟子，王有此山七百餘年，神道有法物不得干，前諸栖託或非眞正，故死病繼之，亦其命也，法師道德所歸，謹捨以奉給，并願受五戒，永結來緣。(法)度曰：人神道殊無容相屈，且檀越血食世祀，此最五戒所禁。(靳)尚曰：若備門徒輒先去殺。於是辭……至月十五日(法)度為設會，(靳)尚又來同眾，禮拜行道受戒而去。攝山廟巫夢神告曰：吾已受戒於度法師，祠祀勿得殺戮。由是廟用薦止菜脯而已(《大正新修大藏經・高僧傳》，50：2059：8，頁380)。

釋法度強調的是「去殺」，因此山神靳尚對廟巫的指示也只是祭祀時「勿得殺戮」，至於供奉臘肉(脯)卻是無所謂。嚴格說來，這倒是符合佛陀當年有關「淨肉」的規定——只要不是爲了某一目的而刻意宰殺的即可。

不過，隨著「不殺生戒」的強調，新素食觀卻也逐漸風行起來。卒於梁武帝天監八年(509)的顧憲之，雖然不是佛教信徒，死前卻交代其子孫歲時祭祀：「唯下素饌，勿用牲牢。……祠先人自有舊典，不可有闕，自吾已下，祠止用蔬食時果，勿同於上世也。」[7] 類似新素食觀的實踐者想必還有不少，至於其代表性論點則可見之於《廣弘明集》裡所收集的〈究竟慈悲論〉(沈約)、〈與何胤書論止殺〉(周顒)與〈誡殺家訓〉(顏之推)[8]。文中反復而言，不外乎「**素食即不殺生，不殺生即慈**

---

7 《梁書》，52，頁760。

8 《大正新修大藏經・廣弘明集》，52：2103：26。

悲」之意。最有趣的是沈約的〈究竟慈悲論〉，孟子所說的：「五畝之宅，樹之以桑，五十者可以衣帛矣；雞豚狗彘之畜，無失其時，七十者可以食肉矣」[9]，講的是「爲政之道」，最終目標當然是希望每個人都能「衣帛食肉」；然而在沈約(441-513)的解釋下，卻轉變成了「慈悲之道」：「然則五(四？)十九年已前，所衣宜布矣；六十九年已前，所食宜蔬矣」。不僅要求素食，連「衣帛」(絲織品)皆在禁止之列，因爲取絲不免要傷害蠶繭，有殺生之嫌；問題是，這個要求可是連一些大乘經典——包括普遍被素食主義者(例如梁武帝)視爲理論根據來源的《大般涅槃經》——都強烈反對的[10]。

佛教徒對於新素食觀的擁護自不足爲奇，有趣的是，連道教——最爲本土性的宗教——創始者之一的葛洪也接受了這個觀點：

凡小山皆無正神為主，多是木石之精，千歲老物，血食之鬼，

---

9 《孟子‧梁惠王(上)》。

10 絲織的衣服在印度稱為「憍奢耶」，而不管是在律典或大乘經典裡都沒有禁止僧侶穿著絲織品的規定。「佛在舍衛國。……有一比丘白佛：聽我著憍施耶衣。佛言：聽汝著憍施耶衣，何以故？憍施耶衣不妨得道，知足少欲乃至隨涅槃」(《大正新修大藏經‧十誦律》，23：1435：27，頁197)。「迦葉復言：『如來若制不食肉者，彼五種味乳酪、酪漿、生酥、熟酥、胡麻油等，及諸衣服憍奢耶衣、珂貝、皮革、金銀盂器，如是等物亦不應受』。『善男子，不應同彼尼乾所見……』」(《大正新修大藏經‧大般涅槃經》，12：375：4，頁626)；「我唯聽食五種牛味及油蜜等，聽著革屣憍奢耶衣」(《大正新修大藏經‧大般涅槃經》，12：375：7，頁647)。因此沈約的鼓吹未免有點矯枉過正，只是後來唐代著名戒律僧(號稱南山律宗之祖)的道宣強烈要求僧侶不得著用絲織品，一時頗有影響。義淨在《南海寄歸內法傳》裡對於此事即曾大力抨擊：「凡論絁絹，乃是聖開，何事強遮，徒為節目，斷之以意，欲省招繁。五天四部並皆著用，詎可棄易求之絹絁，覓難得之細布，妨道之極，其在斯乎。非制強制，即其類也」(《大正新修大藏經‧南海寄歸內法傳》，54：2125，頁212)。有關這方面的討論，詳見諏訪義純，《中國中世佛教史研究》，頁92-128。

> 此輩皆邪鬼，不念為人作福，但能作禍(《抱朴子內篇校釋·卷四金丹》)。
>
> 又諸妖道百餘種，皆煞生血食，獨有李家道無為為小差(《抱朴子內篇校釋·卷九道意》)。
>
> 若有山川社廟血食惡神能作福禍者，以印封泥，斷其道路，則不復能神矣(《抱朴子內篇校釋·卷十七登涉》)。

凡是「血食」的鬼神一律被套上「邪鬼」、「惡神」的稱謂，採取牲祭的道士則是「妖道」——儘管在中國傳統裡，鬼神本來就該是血食的。《抱朴子》的作者葛洪活躍於西元四世紀初，可見當時「殺(煞)生血食」的負面印象已相當深入民間，雖然葛洪並沒有因此而提出全面素食的主張[11]。相傳爲寇謙之所撰的《老君音誦誡經》雖然規定教徒在舉行廚會(齋會)祈福消災時，「素飯菜，一日食米三升，斷房室，五辛生菜諸肉盡斷」[12]，只是，這似乎還是傳統齋戒性的素食。劉宋三天弟子徐氏《三天內解經》卷上所說的：「治病療疾，不得飲酒食肉」[13]，似乎也屬於同樣性質的飲食禁忌。

然而，劉宋時陸修靜(406-477)批評當時道士生活的一段話：「五辛之菜，六畜之肉，道之至忌，噉之已自犯禁，乃復宰殺雞豚鵝鴨，飲酒洪醉」[14]，所反映的毋寧說，已是一種新的、基本上來自大乘佛教的素食觀——「五辛六畜」之類的食物已被視爲「不淨」(道之至忌)，而

11 道教有「木食、辟穀」之術，諏訪義純認為即為「素食」(《中國中世佛教史研究》，頁64)。問題是，道教的「木食、辟穀」之術主要是希望能作到餐風飲露，完全不食人間煙火(包括五穀)，以達到神仙的境界，與素食其實無關。

12 《正統道藏·老君音誦誡經》(台北：新文豐影本，1976)，30，頁0535。

13 《道藏·三天內解經》，48，頁0081。

14 《正統道藏·道門科略》，41，頁0731。上述引文乃是「恣貪欲之性，而耽酒嗜食」的旁註。

「殺生」當然更被賦與負面的價值[15]。可惜的是，儘管陸修靜早在梁武帝建立王朝之前，就已經在道教內部提出新素食觀的要求，他的期望終究沒有能夠實現，否則，也許我們今天提到「吃齋者」的時候，浮現在腦海裡的就應該是道士、而非僧侶的形象了[16]。陸修靜之所以失敗的原因有二：第一，道教並不像大乘佛教一樣，擁有由「不殺生戒」引申而來的一整套有關素食的理論基礎；其次是，陸修靜雖然曾經在劉宋一朝名動公卿，他終究還是一介凡民，而不像梁武帝一樣直接掌控著帝王的權力。

只是，當俗眾與道教宗師都已如此服膺於新素食觀，身為此一理念之始作俑者的佛教出家眾又怎能落於人後[17]？這是西元六世紀初梁武帝要求僧伽全面素食時所面臨的基本壓力。

三、梁武帝

梁武帝(464-549，502-549在位)是中國史上著名的佛教徒，以帝王

15 唯一例外的是飲酒，飲酒在佛教列為基本的「五戒」之一，然而道教並不禁酒，相反的，在某些場合，酒還是必備的，例如廚會時，「應下三槃，初小食，中酒，後飯」(《正統道藏・老君音誦誡經》，30，頁0535)。陸修靜也只能抱怨當時的道士「耽酒嗜食，飲酒洪醉」，要求應有節制。

16 其實，根據陳國符《道藏源流考・道學傳輯佚》裡的記載來看，南北朝時期還是有不少道士是終身素食的，這應當也是在新素食觀影響之下發展起來的，只是始終沒能成為一個普遍性的戒律，其原因將在下文另行討論。陳國符，《道藏源流考》(台北：古亭書屋影本，1975)。

17 有關中國佛教與素食的關係，詳見John Kieschnick(柯嘉豪), *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography*(Honolulu, 1997), pp. 22-28. Richard Mather, "The Bonze's Begging Bowl: Eating Practices in Buddhist Monasteries of Medieval India and China," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 101:4(Oct.-Dec. 1981), pp. 417-424. 道端良秀，《中國佛教思想史の研究》(京都，1979)，頁271-309；諏訪義純，《中國中世佛教史研究》，頁39-91，183-201。

之尊而皈依佛教者在歷史上固不乏其人，然而像梁武帝這麼虔誠的倒是罕得一見。有關梁武帝的生平事業，相關論著甚多，此處即不贅言[18]。這裡想探討的是有關僧伽全面素食的問題，也就是「禁斷酒肉」事件。

我們先敘述一下事件的始末。有趣的是，梁武帝的〈斷酒肉文〉在史上雖享有盛名，詳細的年代卻始終無法確定，或許是《廣弘明集》的編纂者道宣在篤信佛教之餘[19]，也順帶接受了古印度人漠視時間的傳統。不過，根據一些學者的考訂，再參考梁武帝時郭祖深上表抨擊佛教一文裡的兩句話：「陛下皇基兆運二十餘載」與「僧尼皆令蔬食」[20]，我們認為西元523年(普通四年)的五月二十三日與二十九日，應該是比較可靠的日期[21]。

二十三日與二十九日分別是佛教每月的六齋日之一[22]，挑選這個日子自然是有過一番思量的。經過仔細布置與安排後，梁武帝首先在五月二十三日這一天召集了僧尼代表1448人在華林園的華林殿舉行大會，先由「都講」慧明誦唱《大般涅槃經・四相品》裡禁斷肉食的相關經文[23]，再由「法師」法雲講解其中「食肉者斷大慈種」之義，這是當時各

18 新近出版且與本文較有關連的請參見顏尚文，《梁武帝》，(台北：東大，1999)。

19 〈斷酒肉文〉全文詳見《大正新修大藏經・廣弘明集》，52：2103：26，頁294-303。

20 《南史・郭祖深傳》，70，頁1721-22。

21 一些學者認為確定的年代已無法詳究，大致上是在西元517年(天監十六年)至523年(普通四年)之間某一年的五月二十三日與二十九日。諏訪義純，《中國中世佛教史研究》，頁80。顏尚文認為此一事件應在梁武帝受菩薩戒之後，亦即天監十八年(519)四月八日以後的事(《梁武帝》，頁230-1)。

22 也就是前面提到的郗超在〈奉法要〉一文所說的「歲三月六齋」裡的「月六齋」。根據古印度傳統，鬼神常於每月八日、十四日、十五日、二十三日、二十九日與三十日這六日內伺機害人，故於這些日子裡必須沐浴斷食。佛教沿襲此一傳統，規定此六日為「齋日」，僧眾在此日須集會一處，布薩說戒；在家眾則於此日受持一日一夜的八關齋。

23 詳見《大正新修大藏經・大般涅槃經》，12：374：4，頁386。

寺院講經的一般形式，倒也不足爲奇；不過，重頭戲卻是在這開場白之後、由道澄代表梁武帝所宣讀的〈斷酒肉文〉。題目雖有「酒」字，在這篇長達六、七千字的演講裡，提到酒的地方卻很少，這是因爲律典裡本來就有禁酒的戒令：

> 佛告阿難：凡飲酒者有十過失。……佛告阿難：自今以去以我為師者，乃至不得以草木頭內著酒中而入口。爾時世尊以無數方便呵責娑伽陀比丘已，告諸比丘：此娑伽陀比丘癡人，多種有漏處最初犯戒，自今已去與比丘結戒，集十句義乃至正法久住，欲說戒者當如是說，若比丘飲酒者波逸提(《大正新修大藏經・四分律》，22：1428：16，頁672)。

犯「波逸提」者須於布薩僧中懺悔，雖然不算是太嚴重的罪行，只是既已明載於律典，這樣的行爲終究缺乏正當性可言，梁武帝自然毋須對此多費唇舌。相形之下，既然律典裡佛陀已明言「淨肉」可食，想要禁止僧侶食肉無疑是要麻煩多了。梁武帝其實也想不出更好的方法，因此在講稿裡，他除了引經據典苦口婆心地勸告出家眾不要吃肉外，還不惜以身作則發下重誓：

> 弟子今日昌言此事，僧尼必當有不平色，設令刳心擲地以示僧與數片肉無以取信，古人有言非知之難其在行之，弟子蕭衍雖在居家不持戒，今日當先自為誓以明本心：弟子蕭衍從今以去至于道場，若飲酒放逸起諸婬欲，欺誑妄語噉食眾生，乃至飲於乳蜜及以蘇酪，願一切有大力鬼神，先當苦治蕭衍身，然後將付地獄閻羅王與種種苦，乃至眾生皆成佛盡，弟子蕭衍，猶在阿鼻地獄中。

出家眾相對地當然也要受到同樣的約束：「僧尼若有飲酒噉魚肉者而不悔過，一切大力鬼神亦應如此治問」。只是，梁武帝也了解到，幽冥的果報若是有效，出家眾的食肉早就不該成爲問題。更何況，他們還可以利用大小乘經典的自相矛盾作爲藉口，以解脫良心的譴責。國家力量(王法)的介入至此成爲不得已的手段：

> 今日大德僧尼，今日義學僧尼，今日寺官，宜自警戒嚴淨徒眾，若其懈怠不遵佛教，猶是梁國編户一民，弟子今日力能治制，若猶不依佛法，是諸僧官宜依法問。
>
> 弟子蕭衍於十方一切諸佛前，於十方一切尊法前，於十方一切聖僧前，與諸僧尼共申約誓，今日僧眾還寺已後，各各檢勒使依佛教。若復飲酒噉肉不如法者，弟子當依王法治問，諸僧尼若被如來衣不行如來行，是假名僧，與賊盜不異，如是行者猶是弟子國中編户一民，今日以王力足相治問，若為外司聽察所得，若為寺家自相糾舉，不問年時老少，不問門徒多少，弟子當令寺官集僧眾鳴揵槌，捨戒還俗著在家服，依涅槃經還俗策使，唯取老舊者，最多門徒者，此二種人最宜先問，何以故？治一無行小僧，不足以改革物心，治如是一大僧，足以驚動視聽。
>
> 僧尼若有飲酒噉魚肉者而不悔過，一切大力鬼神亦應如此治問，增廣善眾清淨佛道。若未為幽司之所治問猶在世者，弟子蕭衍，當加法治問，驅令還俗與居家衣隨時役使。

在佛教律法裡，逐出教團是最重的懲罰，稱爲「波羅夷」；只有少數幾項罪行，例如犯了淫戒、殺人等，才會遭受到如此嚴厲的處罰。梁武帝下令僧侶若違反酒肉禁令即逐出教團，可說是法外加刑，即使是在《梵網經》裡，「食肉」也只不過被列爲「四十八輕垢」之一。此外，

根據律典的規定，僧侶違反戒律也只能接受僧團的處置，外人其實不得干涉；梁武帝在這裡當然是決定以法王的身分親自處理此事，雖然有違佛教規定，卻也可看出梁武帝對此事注重的程度。只是，完全仰賴高壓的手段當然也不成。當時人們或出家眾反對徹底素食的理由之一其實是與健康有關的——蔬食會導致人體「虛冷」。蔬食是否真的有礙健康？坦白說，這是一個直到今日爲止也還無法完全以現代醫學確定的問題。我們曉得，流傳於東南亞一帶的南傳佛教一向並不忌諱肉食，不過近年來，在西方素食運動的影響下，斯里蘭卡(Sri Lanka)年輕一輩的僧侶確也有人提出全面素食的主張，只是理所當然地遭到強烈的反對，反對的理由除了「不合戒律」外，有礙健康亦是主要訴求之一[24]。實際上，一直到梁武帝的時代爲止，根據史書上的記載，此一觀點可說是相當深入人心的，甚至連佛門中人都有這樣的看法：

> (弘微)兄曜歷御史中丞，彭城王義康驃騎長史，元嘉四年卒。弘微蔬食積時，哀戚過禮，服雖除，猶不噉魚肉。沙門釋慧琳詣弘微，弘微與之共食，猶獨蔬素。慧琳曰：「檀越素既多疾，頃者肌色微損，即吉之後，猶未復膳。若以無益傷生，豈所望於得理」(《宋書・謝弘微》，58，頁1592)。
>
> (陳文帝)又以(虞荔)蔬食積久，非羸疾所堪，乃敕曰：「卿年事已多，氣力稍減，方欲仗委，良須克壯。今給卿魚肉，不得固從所執」。荔終不從(《南史・虞荔》，69，頁1680)。
>
> 植之少善莊、老，能玄言，……少遭父憂，因菜食二十三載，後得風冷疾，乃止(《梁書・嚴植之》，48，頁671)。

24 Bandu Masakorala, "The Vegetarian Movement in Sri Lanka", 33rd World Vegetarian Congress (Chiang Mai, Thailand, January 4-10, 1999).

即使是梁武帝自己在初行素食時，也曾經因爲「菜食未習體過黃羸」[25]。可見素食有礙健康在當時幾乎已成爲一種共識。梁武帝素食的緣由，下面會再論及，只是他既然要求僧侶素食，〈斷酒肉文〉自然要針對這一點作出回應：

> 凡不能離魚肉者皆云：菜蔬冷於人虛乏，魚肉溫於人補益。作如是說皆是倒見。今試復粗言，其事不爾。若久食菜人榮衛流通，凡如此人法多患熱，榮衛流通則能飲食，以飲食故氣力充滿。是則菜蔬不冷能有補益。諸苦行人亦皆菜蔬，多悉患熱類皆堅強，神明清爽少於昏疲。凡魚為性類皆多冷，血腥為法增長百疾，所以食魚肉者神明理當昏濁。……此豈非惑者用心各有所執。甘魚肉者便謂為溫為補，此是倒見事不可信。復有一種人，食菜以為冷便復解素，此是行者未得菜意。菜與魚肉如水與火，食菜裁欲得力，復噉魚肉，魚肉腥燥能減菜力，所以惑者云，菜為性冷。凡數解素人，進不得菜蔬之力，退不得魚肉邪益，法多羸冷少有堪能。

梁武帝自己顯然是克服了此一問題，他雖然吃素，卻還是健康活潑地活到八十二歲（要不是侯景之亂說不定還可以活得更久），只是就他上述的說辭而言，似乎也沒有太大的說服力。這倒不能怪他，以當時的醫學水準無法對此問題提供一個肯定的答案，似乎也是理所當然的。不過他的用心良苦，從這番言論倒是可見一斑。

除此之外，爲了說服群僧素食乃是大勢所趨，梁武帝甚至還舉例說明當時其他一般的民間信仰，在祭祀時供品也都已經採取素食：

---

25 《大正新修大藏經・廣弘明集・淨業賦》，52：2103：29，頁336。

北山蔣帝猶且去殺，若以不殺祈願輒得上教，若以殺祈願輒不得教想。今日大眾已應聞知，弟子已勒諸廟祀及以百姓凡諸群祀，若有祈報者皆不得薦生類，各盡誠心止修蔬供。蔣帝今日行菩薩道，諸出家人云何反食眾生行諸魔行。一日北山為蔣帝齋，所以皆請菜食僧者，正以幽靈悉能鑒見，若不菜食僧作菜食往，將恐蔣帝惡賤佛法怪望弟子。

這裡所說的蔣帝指的是流行於南北朝時期的「蔣子文信仰」。至於蔣子文是否真正顯靈要求信眾供奉素食？或者僅只是在梁武帝的詔令下不得不改爲吃素？我們自然是不得而知了[26]。

然而，在這次大會之後不過幾天，梁武帝就發現事情的發展並沒有如他所想像的那麼樂觀。起因之一是，在法會中當法雲講解涅槃經斷肉事時，掌管全國僧伽事務的僧正慧超與宣武寺的法寵就曾質疑：若照經文禁斷一切肉食，乃至自死者皆不得食，那麼，這與耆那教徒(尼揵)禁止使用皮革、因此也不得著皮鞋的規定又有何差異？再說，既然佛陀已准許僧侶著皮鞋，就沒有理由不准食肉[27]。雖然法雲當場已針對此一問難作出答覆(〈斷酒肉文〉並沒有記載答覆的內容)，梁武帝認爲還不夠清楚，「恐諸小僧，執以爲疑，方成巨蔽」。其次是，即使在這樣的苦心勸服與威嚇之下，二十三日的法會結束之後，梁武帝還是聽到了不少抱怨與不服之語：

諸僧尼或猶云：「律中無斷肉事及懺悔食肉法」。

26 有關蔣子文信仰的演變，詳見林富士，〈中國六朝時期的蔣子文信仰〉，《遺跡崇拜與聖者崇拜》(台北：允晨，1999)。

27 詳見註10。

以此，二十九日梁武帝再度召集僧尼代表198人於華光殿舉行第二次的法會，人數減少了這麼多，可見已是全國僧團的領導階層。這次他的態度明顯地嚴峻許多，當場直接與僧尼辯駁，而凡是對禁斷肉食一事存有絲毫懷疑之心、或者本身平時就無法力行素食者，例如僧辯、寶度與法寵等人，都遭到梁武帝毫不留情的駁斥。在這次法會中被點名批判的幾個人，可說都屬於僧團裡全國性的人物，與梁武帝也有特殊的關係，例如慧超與法寵都是梁武帝的家僧，慧超還身兼全國僧團總管，權位之重在僧團中可說是無與倫比；至於僧辯，《續高僧傳》中說他「威德冠眾解行高物，傳業之盛獨步江表」，無疑也是個領導者。這麼高階的僧侶當場遭到毫不留情的申斥，對於其他在場旁觀的僧團代表而言，無疑是場極具威嚇效果的震撼教育。

梁武帝禁斷僧團酒肉的回響如何，史無明言，不過在當時客觀環境的要求下，南方僧團大概就此接受了。剩下來的問題就是：北方的僧團又是在什麼時候採取了全面素食的主張？關於這一點，可惜的是我們並沒有像梁武帝的〈斷酒肉文〉那樣清楚而直接的證據。也可能北方的僧團並不像南方那樣，在帝王的一紙詔令下改絃易轍，而是逐步地走上全面素食的道路。只是這應當不會早於梁武帝禁斷南方僧團酒肉之前，否則他就不必那麼大費周章了。當然，由於北方的政治力量對於佛教僧團的管制一向遠比南方要來得更積極(南北朝兩次的滅佛事件皆出之於北方即可想見)；因此，北方僧團的全面素食如果是出之於當時政治力量的運作自然也是極有可能的。從這個角度來觀察，北齊的文宣帝(550-559)倒是相當符合我們的標準——換言之，北方的僧團似乎是有可能在他的統治時期接受了全面素食的戒律。

天保二年(551)，文宣帝在釋僧稠的感召下成爲佛教信徒[28]。只是，嚴格說來，文宣帝實在算不上是個多麼值得稱道的皇帝，從他的一

28 《大正新修大藏經・續高僧傳》，50：2026：16，頁554。

些作爲裡(尤其是晚年)，我們也看不出他真正接受了多少佛教的教誨，至少在與梁武帝相形之下確是如此。《北齊書》的〈帝紀〉對他最後的評論是這樣的：

> 既征伐四克，威振戎夏，六七年後，以功業自矜，遂留連耽湎，肆行淫暴。或躬自鼓舞，歌謳不息，從旦通宵，以夜繼晝。或袒露形體，塗傅粉黛，散髮胡服，雜衣錦綵。拔刃張弓，遊於市肆……。徵集淫嫗，分付從官，朝夕臨視，以為娛樂。凡諸殺害，多令支解，或焚之於火，或投之於河。沉酗既久，彌以狂惑，至於末年，每言見諸鬼物，亦云聞異音聲。情有蒂芥，必在誅戮，諸元宗室咸加屠勦……。自餘酷濫，不可勝紀。朝野憯憎，各懷怨毒。……又多所營繕，百役繁興，舉國騷擾，公私勞弊。凡諸賞費，無復節限，府藏之積，遂至空虛。自皇太后諸王及內外勳舊，愁懼危悚，計無所出。暨于末年，不能進食，唯數飲酒，麴糵成災，因而致斃(《北齊書》，4，頁67-68)。

既然是「情有蒂芥，必在誅戮」，文宣帝在歷史上會得到個殘暴好殺的惡評自不令人意外。然而，這只是對人如此，對於其他的生物可就不然了。根據《北齊書》的記載：

> 天保七年(558)，帝以肉為斷慈，遂不復食(《北齊書》，4，頁61)。
>
> 天保八年，詔諸取蝦蟹蜆蛤之類，悉令停斷，唯聽捕魚。……詔公私鷹鷂俱亦禁絕(《北齊書》，4，頁63)。
>
> 天保八年，詔丘、郊、禘、祫、時祀，皆仰市取，少牢不得剖割，有司監視，必令豐備；農社先蠶，酒肉而已；雩、禖、

> 風、雨、司民、司祿、靈星、雜祀，果餅酒脯。唯當務盡誠敬，義同如在[29]（《北齊書》，4，頁64）。
>
> 天保九年，詔限仲冬一月燎野，不得他時行火，損昆虫草木（《北齊書》，4，頁64）。

這可完全是遵照佛教慈悲爲懷的教誨了，最後一道詔令還擴大及於昆蟲草木。《續高僧傳》裡也說他：

> 率土之內，禁斷酒肉，放捨鷹犬，畋漁屠殺，普國不行；年三月六[30]，勸民齋戒，公私葷菜，悉滅除之（《大正新修大藏經・續高僧傳》，50：2060：15，頁549）。

換言之，新素食觀的奉行甚至普及到一般民間（雖然難免有些誇張），在這樣的背景下，再加上梁武帝要求南方僧團全面禁斷酒食距離當時也不過才三十年，因此，我們是否可以合理地推測：北方僧團的全面採行素食應該就在文宣帝的統治時期。道宣在《續高僧傳》的一篇論述中曾說過：「且夫佛教道東，世稱弘播，論其榮茂，勿盛梁齊」，而在南北朝的眾多帝王裡，他也只推崇梁武帝和北齊文宣帝兩人對佛教的貢獻——雖然我們從歷史文獻中委實很難發現文宣帝對佛教的具體貢獻究竟如何，只是，其中想必有其深意在[31]。

不管怎麼說，我們所能確定的是：在梁武帝的〈斷酒肉文〉宣布

---

29 這應該就是《北齊書》裡所說的「宗廟不血食」一事：「（高）元海好亂樂禍，然詐仁慈，不飲酒噉肉。文宣天保末年敬信內法，乃至宗廟不血食，皆元海所謀」（14，頁184）。這裡似乎也可以看出文宣帝在關於佛教信仰的作為上，確實有些模仿梁武帝的痕跡，雖然並不容易找到直接的證據。

30 即郗超在〈奉法要〉裡所說的「歲三月六齋」。

31 《大正新修大藏經・續高僧傳》，50：2026：15，頁548-549。

後，素食自此成爲中國佛教徒的普遍戒律，肉食(不管「淨肉」與否)則被視爲一種「不正當」的行爲，一直到今天爲止仍然如此。

梁武帝禁斷僧團酒肉後，實際上的成效究竟如何？這裡先舉個具體的例子。曾因滅佛而名列中國佛教史上「三武之禍」的北周武帝(560-578)——其他兩個分別是北魏太武帝和唐武宗——在建德三年(574)的宗教大會上批判佛法的不淨時，居然以「經律中准許僧尼受食三種淨肉」爲佛教三大不淨之一[32]。換言之，由於梁武帝的禁斷僧團酒肉(距此時也只不過是半個世紀的光景)，在北周武帝的觀念裡，佛教僧團的素食根本就是天經地義的，殊不知除了佛陀沒有禁止僧尼肉食外，即使是中國的僧團，一直到梁武帝禁斷酒肉爲止，也是不忌腥羶的。

佛教史料也可以提供給我們一些線索。在慧皎的《高僧傳》(成書於梁武帝時期，六世紀初)與道宣的《續高僧傳》(成書於唐太宗晚年，七世紀中葉)裡，提到終身持素者共有六十九人，其中六十二人在隋唐以前，隋唐則僅有七人，可見自梁武帝禁斷僧伽酒肉後，素食逐漸成爲中國佛教僧團的一個傳統，因此隋唐僧人的素食已被視爲當然而毋庸再特別記載。至於僧傳裡提到隋唐僧人素食的場合也相當有意思：

> (隋)那連提黎耶舍，隋言尊稱，北天竺烏場國人。……又往突厥客館，勸持六齋，羊料放生受行素食(《大正新修大藏經・續高僧傳》，50：2060：2，頁432)。
>
> (唐)釋善伏，一名等照，姓蔣，常州義興人，生即白首，性知遠離，五歲於安國寺兄才法師邊出家，布衣蔬食日誦經卷。……後共暉才二師，入桑梓山行慈悲觀，又為鬼神受戒莫噉肉，神又降巫者，令召伏受戒，巫者殺生祀神，神打之次死，降語曰：吾已於伏闍梨受戒，誓不食肉，如何為吾殺生，

32 《大正新修大藏經・續高僧傳》，50：2060：23，頁631。

愍爾愚癡且恕汝命，後更爾者必加至死。自後諸祀永絕羶腥。常婺州二人，同載績麻為貨至江神所，一以蔬祭，一欲殺生，而未行，其麻並濕，前蔬祭麻並乾燥，於是行人忌憚無敢肉祭。故其授戒功驗，人神敬仰，有陵犯者立見禍害，江淮閭屠販魚肉，鵝鴨雞豬之屬，受法開放，市無行肆(《大正新修大藏經・續高僧傳》，50：2060：26，頁602-603)[33]。

換言之，當時的僧侶不僅自己素食，甚至還有意更進一步推廣到一般的民間大眾，包括鬼神祭祀、乃至突厥人(游牧民族)，這倒是頗具雄心壯志的。在素食主義的鼓舞之下，有些僧侶甚至還企圖將這份用心推展爲民間全面性的戒酒運動：

釋玄鑒，俗姓焦，澤州高平人(今山西高平)也。天性仁慈志樂清潔，酒肉葷辛自然厭離。……行值飲噉非法，無不面諫訶毀，極言過狀不避強禦。或與語不受者，便碎之酒器，不酬其費。故諸俗士聚集醼飲，聞鑒來至並即奔散。由是七眾尊虔，敬其嚴厲重其清貞。數有繕造，工匠繁多，豪族之人或遺酒食。鑒云：「吾今所營，必令如法，乍可不造，理無飲酒」。遂即止之(《大正新修大藏經・續高僧傳》，50：2060：15，頁542)。

比之二十世紀三十年代美國清教徒轟轟烈烈的禁酒運動，似乎也不遑多讓。

33 我們可以注意到，同樣是山神受戒，在前引《高僧傳》釋法度的例子裡(第二節)，山神只被要求「勿得殺戮」，因此祭祀時還可供奉臘肉，此處則更進一步要求「莫噉肉」、「諸祀永絕羶腥」，換言之，連臘肉都不被允許。

話說回來，是否自從梁武帝禁斷僧團酒肉後，中國的僧侶就真的再也不沾酒肉，事情當然沒有這麼理想。唐代名僧同時也是書法名家的懷素(737-？)就曾留下著名的〈食魚帖〉，日常生活飲食也不忌諱酒肉，這點從他的詩文即可發現[34]。當時與他來往的一些詩人墨客似乎也夷然不以爲異。不過，懷素的故事大概只能算是個特例，對於一般的僧尼而言，禁絕酒肉仍然是他們必須遵守的戒律之一，這也是社會一般人對他們的期待。然而，人非聖賢，戒律再怎麼嚴格，犯戒的僧侶還是在所難免，再加上敵視佛教的人也不斷製造僧尼違反清規、飲酒吃肉的傳聞。有時則對僧尼的素食出之以嘲諷的態度，例如《東坡志林》卷二「道釋」項即有這麼一條的記載：「僧謂酒爲般若湯，謂魚爲水梭花，雞爲鑽籬菜，竟無所益，但欺而已，世常笑之」。面對這樣的指控或確實存在的現象，佛教史傳的作者基本上確立了三項處理的方針。

第一，爲長者諱，雖然這意味著有時不得不掩飾真相。例如在梁武帝禁斷僧團酒肉之前，中國僧侶肉食根本算不上什麼大不了的問題。因此，隋代的費長房在《歷代三寶記》卷十一裡就記載了下述的故事：梁武帝的家僧僧伽婆羅來自東南亞一帶，有一次到臨川王府，臨川王問他素食還是肉食，他答道：「菜食，病時解素」，又問：「今日何如？」「由四種元素所構成的凡人之軀，那有不生病的時候？」臨川王大樂，即刻爲他準備宴席——當然是治病所需的肉食[35]。然而，等到唐代道宣編寫《續高僧傳》時，在卷一的僧伽婆羅傳裡，對於上述這段故事，除了「太尉臨川王宏，接遇隆重」一句外，其他則隻字不提[36]。

其次，佛教史傳既以「高僧」爲名，記述的照說應當是一些立德、立功、立言，足以流芳百世的僧人。道宣在《續高僧傳》序言裡即明白

34 John Kieschnick, *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography* (Honolulu, 1997), p. 64.

35 《大正新修大藏經・歷代三寶記》，49：2034：11，頁98。

36 《大正新修大藏經・續高僧傳》，50：2060：1，頁426。

列出「譯經、解義、護法」等十項品德或業績作爲入傳的標準，而百分之九十九以上的僧傳的確也都能符合上述這些標準中的某一項。然而其中卻也有些僧傳，傳主所爲完全不合序言所列出的標準，例如卷二十五的釋明解傳。據傳中所言，釋明解日常飲食即不守清規，更於酒後賦詩詆毀佛教，故死後墜入惡道，受饑渴之苦[37]。這個傳記擺明了是當反面教材用的，換言之，是以冥報或轉生惡趣來恐嚇那些違反清規的僧人。其實，類似的手法早在南北朝時就已有人採用過。同樣是道宣編纂的《廣弘明集》裡即收錄有顏之推的〈誡殺訓〉，幾則小故事翻來覆去不外是說明：「去殺之事必勉行之，見好殺之人臨死報驗，子孫殃禍其數甚多」[38]。

最有創意的是第三種對策。慧皎在梁武帝時編寫《高僧傳》，雖然刻意褒揚終身持素的僧侶，對於某些飲酒吃肉的僧人卻也照實記載，有意思的是這些僧人，例如杯度、釋慧通、釋保(寶)誌等人，碰巧都出現在卷十「神異」的類別裡，雖然他並沒有特別說明「飲酒吃肉」究竟與「神異」有著什麼樣的關係，卻巧妙地給讀者留下不少想像的空間。這個想像空間在道宣的《續高僧傳》裡終於有了進一步的落實：

> 香闍梨者，莫測其來，以梁初至益州青城山飛赴寺，欣然有終志。時俗每至三月三日，必往山遊賞，多將酒肉共相酣樂，前後勸喻曾未能斷。後年三月，又如前集，例坐已了，香(闍梨)令人於座穿坑方丈，人莫知意。謂人曰：「檀越等恒自飲噉，未曾與香(闍梨)，今日為眾須餐一頓」。諸人爭奉肴酒，隨得隨盡，若塡巨壑，識者怪之。至晚曰：「我大醉飽，扶我就坑，不爾污地」。及至坑所，張口大吐，雞肉自口出，即能飛鳴，羊肉自口出，即馳走。酒食亂出，將欲滿坑。魚鮮鵝鴨游

37 《大正新修大藏經‧續高僧傳》，50：2060：25，頁665。
38 《大正新修大藏經‧廣弘明集》，52：2103：26，頁294。

泳交錯，眾咸驚嗟，誓斷辛殺。迄今酒肉，永絕上山，此香(闍梨)之風德也(《大正新修大藏經・續高僧傳》，50：2060：25，頁657)。

有意思的是，《高僧傳》的作者慧皎在記述釋保誌的「神異」時，也曾經提到釋保誌有一次忽然要求吃活魚，信徒即刻爲他辦妥，結果等到釋保誌吃飽離去，那人回頭一瞧，「盆中魚游活如故」[39]。只不過，慧皎並沒有針對這個「奇蹟」多做解釋，解釋的工作還得留待道宣來完成，而「飲酒吃肉」與「神異」也才有了個完美的結合——僧人的「飲酒吃肉」原來是爲了要達成讓一般俗眾不再飲酒吃肉的手段。正如《大般涅槃經》裡所說的[40]：「是故菩薩不習食肉，爲度眾生示現食肉，雖現食之其實不食」。算得上是用心良苦了。

贊寧在《宋高僧傳》裡也如法炮製，例如〈唐興元府梁山寺上座亡名傳〉：

釋亡名者，不知何許人也。居褒城西數十里，號中梁山。……行終詭異言語不常。……平常酷嗜酒而食肉。又綱任眾事且多折中，僧亦畏焉，號為上座。時群緇伍一皆傚習，唯此無懼。上座察知而興歎曰：「未住淨心地，何敢逆行，逆行非諸人境界，且世云，金以火試。待吾一日一時試過」。開成中(836-840)忽作大餅招集徒眾曰：「與汝曹遊尸陀林去」。蓋城外山野多墳塚，人所棄屍於此，故云也。上座踞地舒餅，裹腐爛死屍向口便啖，俊快之狀頗嘉。同遊諸僧皆掩鼻唾地而走，上座大叫曰：「汝等能餐此肉，方可餐他肉也已」。自此緇徒警

39 《大正新修大藏經・高僧傳》，50：2059：10，頁394。
40 《大正新修大藏經・大般涅槃經》，12：374：4，頁386。

悟，化成精苦焉，遠近歸信(《大正新修大藏經・宋高僧傳》，50：2061：21，頁847)。

旋律不變，只是這次「聖僧」示化的對象不是一般的俗眾，而是他座下的僧侶。不過，「腐爛屍肉」固然不容易吃，比起讓吃下去的雞羊復活，似乎可行性還是要高些。贊寧大概也想到了這個神話的破綻：萬一哪個僧人真的狠下心來，吃起「腐爛屍肉」，然後宣稱自己「得道」，豈不是要搞得天下大亂。因此，他特別在傳後加了一段警語：「如有妄云得果此例而行，則如何野干鳴擬學獅子吼者乎」[41]。

是否真有哪個僧人不自量力東施效顰學起獅子吼來，我們不得而知。不過，從《續高僧傳》與《宋高僧傳》裡所描述的這些「聖僧」的神跡看來，中國民間社會所神化了的濟顛(濟公)——「酒肉和尚」兼「聖僧」的代表性人物——似乎都可以在此找到其原始的雛型。

梁武帝爲何要如此大費苦心地推動佛教僧團的素食運動？而當時的佛教僧團又爲何願意如此配合？「王力足相治問」固然是個重要因素，在國家力量的威脅下，梁朝的僧侶不管意願如何，大概也沒有太多選擇餘地。只是，〈斷酒肉文〉頒布之後不過三、四十年，梁朝即已滅亡(557年)，其他的君主不見得有梁武帝那樣的虔誠，想要嚴格地執行僧團素食的規定。再說，就算梁武帝對僧團素食的意願如何堅定，當時他所能掌控的領土不過只及於淮河以南，北方的僧團並不在他統治之下，就算後來得到北齊文宣帝的支持，文宣帝的統治時期更爲短暫(只有九年)，爲何北方僧團仍然接受了素食的要求？這些問題的解答必須從更爲廣闊的政治、社會與經濟的背景去尋找。

梁武帝登基時(502年)，佛教傳入中國已有四、五個世紀之久，教團

41 有關僧傳中「酒肉和尚」與「聖僧」之間關係的討論，詳見John Kieschnick, *The Eminent Monk*, pp. 51-66.

的人數也持續不斷地擴張，根據一份粗略的估計，當時南方的僧尼數約在八萬人上下，北方則應在十萬人以上。相對於當時中國全體人口而言(約三、四千萬)，比率可說相當低，如果這些人都分散在山野與世隔離的話，中國社會或許根本就感覺不到這群人的存在。問題是，佛教從一進入中國開始，就是個城市的宗教。這點倒也不足為奇，城市從來就是個人群聚集的地方，因此，也只有城市才能提供給傳教者最為便利廣大的市場與充沛的資源。這也是為何所有的世界性宗教(例如佛教、基督教與回教)，毫無例外的，打從一開始就都是從城市開展其宣教事業的。中國的寺院、僧侶當然也有許多是處於山野之中的，然而就算是像廬山慧遠(334-416)那樣離塵出世的高僧，儘管終身不出虎溪一步，與當時京師權貴的交往卻也相當頻繁，這點只要翻翻他的傳記，看看《弘明集》裡他所留下來的一些書信即可瞭然。慧遠如此，其他僧侶就更不用說了。

出家眾既然無法避免與中國世俗社會的交涉，本身又是一個外來的宗教，彼此之間的爭執衝突自然在所難免。從東漢末年牟子的〈理惑篇〉開始，一直到梁武帝時，這個論爭已持續了幾個世紀：舉凡從彼世形而上的生死輪迴、靈魂之有無，一直到此世政治上的君主與僧侶之分際，經濟上的坐食者身分，生活上的服飾舉止、飲食習慣等，都成為僧俗間爭論的議題。有關這些論爭的原始文獻，皆收集在梁代僧佑(445-518)與唐代道宣(596-667)所編輯的《弘明集》與《廣弘明集》裡[42]，湯用彤的《漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史》裡也有詳盡的討論[43]，此處即不贅言。

這些論爭有的或許只是士大夫之間一種哲理性的探討，例如生死輪迴與靈魂有無之類的問題，也頗為契合當時流行的清談玄學之風。然而其他比較具體與世俗性的爭論，例如君主與僧侶之分際乃至生計衣著等等問題，最終其實可以歸納成一個原則性的問題，那就是：出家眾究竟

42 收入《大正新修大藏經》第52冊。
43 詳見第十三章〈佛教之南統〉與第十四章〈佛教之北統〉。

要在這個社會扮演什麼樣的角色？說得更具體些，在傳統中國士農工商的四民社會裡，出家眾到底屬於那一個階層？換言之，出家眾的「身分」問題，即使在佛教已經傳入中國將近五百年之後，仍然沒有得到一個根本的解決。然而，不管對出家眾或是世俗社會而言，這都是一個極具關鍵性、也是梁武帝想要徹底解決的問題。

在〈斷酒肉文〉一開始，梁武帝就明白向參與大會的僧眾指出：佛教僧侶飲酒食肉的話，在社會評價上，不但比不上其他出家人(外道)，甚至連在家人都不如，至於會遭到非議的緣故，根據他的觀察則各有九項。梁武帝所指控的這十八項罪狀能否言之成理？當時的社會大眾是否會認同他的觀點？這些姑且不論，反正以帝王之尊親口宣示，在當時大概已可視同法律判決。不過，梁武帝真正想警告僧眾的其實是：如果在這個社會上，僧侶既不如其他出家人，又不如在家俗眾，那麼還有他們的立足之地嗎？換言之，在他看來，除非中國的佛教出家眾有其獨特、且值得尊敬的生活樣式(Lebensfuehrung)，足以讓人一目瞭然地將其與外道和一般俗眾清楚區分開來，換言之，也就是佛教僧團必須塑造出一種屬於自己的形象與身分，否則終究是難以見容於中國社會。這是梁武帝堅持佛教僧侶必須拒絕酒肉的主要緣故。

嚴格說來，梁武帝並非當時第一個有此想法的人，前面曾提到過，劉宋時道教宗師陸修靜就曾經想為道士塑造類似的生活樣式與形象，他的《道門科略》及其他一些有關齋戒儀範的著作，可說都是為此目的而寫作的[44]。由此我們亦可了解，雖然在〈斷酒肉文〉中，梁武帝並沒有指明所謂的「外道」到底是何門派，道教無疑是浮現在他當時腦海中的；因為，通貫整個魏晉南北朝時期，與佛教爭奪中國宗教獨尊地位的唯一團體正是道教。實際上，梁武帝在皈依佛教之前，也曾經是個虔誠的道教徒，即使在正式成為佛教徒之後，他和當代的道教名流如陶宏景

44 湯一介，《魏晉南北朝時期的道教》(台北：東大，1991)，頁273-290。

等人仍時相往還[45]，因此，對於當年陸修靜的想法與作法，梁武帝是絕不可能一無所知的。

「飲食男女，人之大欲存焉」，能克服這兩項人類本能的重大誘惑，無疑是可以得到一般人的欽佩與尊敬。梁武帝當年以篡奪的方式從同宗手裡取得帝位，雖說是順天應人，終究難免問心有愧，爲了證明自己之取天下並非貪圖榮華富貴的享受，於是決定斷絕男女之欲：「朕又自念，有天下本非宿志。……誰知我不貪天下，唯當行人所不能行者，令天下有以知我心。復斷房室，不與嬪侍同屋而處，四十餘年矣」。同樣的，力行素食則是爲了證明他的孝心。這些在他的〈淨業賦序〉一文裡點點滴滴都有詳細的交代[46]。

「行人所不能行者，令天下有以知我心」，這是梁武帝自己的經驗談，他會想到將親身的經驗轉移到佛教僧團，或許也不是件太令人詫異的事。僧團如果真能如他所期望的那樣，除了「戒淫」(拒絕女色的誘惑)之外，更能「戒酒肉」(拒絕美食的誘惑)[47]，那麼，在中國社會無疑可以一新眾人耳目——我們曉得，在中國世俗社會的禮法裡，只有喪禮與重要的宗教祭典等場合，才會要求參與者暫時性地齋戒(禁絕房事與酒肉)，若有人能長期如此，在世俗人眼中實已臻「超凡入聖」的境界(雖然一般人也許並無意於此)。然而，一直到梁武帝的時代爲止，「戒淫」固然已被當時的僧團視爲一項普遍性的規範，「戒酒肉」卻還始終停留在僧侶個人修行的範疇。持齋終身的僧侶在世時自是俗眾崇拜敬仰的對象，身後也可以博得《高僧傳》作者的青睞表揚；只是這種崇拜敬仰，究其實，頂多只能

45 陳國符，《道藏源流考》，頁277-278。

46 《大正新修大藏經・廣弘明集》，52：2103：29，頁336。

47 梁武帝自己在〈淨業賦〉中說：「及至南面富有天下，遠方珍羞貢獻相繼，海內異食莫不必至，方丈滿前百味盈俎，乃方食輟箸對案流泣，恨不得以及溫凊朝夕供養，何心獨甘此膳，因爾蔬食不噉魚肉」(《大正新修大藏經・廣弘明集》，52：336：29，頁336)，可見梁武帝也是將魚肉視為美食，為了追思父母而素食。

算是修行者個人的自業自得，而與僧團整體的形象並無多大的關係。換言之，單只是一種個人性的修行，並無法使整個僧團與世俗社會截然劃分開來，從而取得超然於士農工商之上的一種獨特的「身分」——除非這種修行能成爲佛教僧團一項普遍性的戒律。梁武帝如此雷厲風行地禁斷僧侶酒肉一事的用意，應當可以從這裡找到一個解答。

從這個角度來看，慧皎在梁武帝時開始著手撰寫《高僧傳》，顯然也已體會到當時瀰漫在中國社會裡、對於佛教僧侶「身分」的質疑：佛教僧團存在的意義究竟是什麼？僧侶戒慎苦修的目的是爲了什麼？因此，透過450年來(西元67-519)數百位僧侶的現身說法，慧皎希望能向俗世大眾——尤其是貴族士人階級——提供上述這些問題的解答，這是《高僧傳》寫作的目的之一。其次則是，就像梁武帝想藉著禁斷僧人酒肉，爲中國僧團塑造出一種新的生活樣式與形象，慧皎也希望能透過《高僧傳》，爲僧侶提供一個行爲模式的規範。慧皎在《高僧傳》裡開宗明義就列出了入傳的十個判準：一、譯經，二、義解，三、神異，四，習禪，五，明律，六，遺身，七，誦經，八，興福，九，經師，十，唱導。換言之，符合這些成就的才可入傳，這倒是有點類似我們今天所謂的「入祀忠烈祠」的意思。基於見賢思齊的原則，《高僧傳》裡的記載無疑給後代的僧侶指點出一個遵循的方向。更重要的是，慧皎在《高僧傳》裡所樹立的準則，除了個別極細微的修正外，成爲此後所有《高僧傳》——包括道宣的《續高僧傳》、贊寧的《宋高僧傳》以及如惺的《大明高僧傳》——的典範，這些傳記對於規範塑造中國僧人的行爲模式無疑發揮了極大的影響力[48]。

羅馬不是一天造成的，歷史當然也不可能只憑一兩個人——就算他

48 參見Arthur Wright, "Biography and Hagiography: Hui-chiao's Lives of Eminent Monks," In *Silver Jubilee Volume*(Kyoto University: Jimbun kagaku kenkyu-sho, 1954), pp. 383-432; John Kieschnick, *The Eminent Monk*, pp. 6-15; 139-145.

們是帝王也罷——的力量就出現大逆轉。在促成中國佛教僧團生活全面素食化這項工作上，梁武帝與文宣帝固然扮演了極具關鍵性的角色，然而，更堅實的基礎卻是在此之前的百餘年間、透過新素食觀在中國社會長期的潛移默化才奠定下來的。

值得注意的是，在這個過程中，「殺生」與「肉(血)食」雖然成功地被賦與某種程度的負面價值，中國人卻始終沒有真正視肉食爲「不淨」(儘管陸修靜曾說過：「六畜之肉，道之至忌」一類的話)。這一方面是由於，「肉食爲美食」在中國已是個根深柢固的傳統觀念；其次則是，中國人對食物並沒有像印度人和猶太人那種宗教性的潔淨觀。因此，梁武帝在說服僧侶力行素食時，著重的是：「食肉即殺生，殺生則傷慈，無慈悲心何以爲僧」這樣的一套邏輯，基本上並不刻意去強調肉食是否「不淨」的問題——實際上，當社會一般人仍抱持著「肉食即美食」的觀念時，似乎反而更能凸顯出佛教僧侶「出世」的身分與形象。

除了要求僧侶在修行上能具備作爲一個「人天師」的資格——換言之，也就是爲僧團在中國社會裡取得一種「身分」的認可外，梁武帝顯然也考慮到他們在世俗社會裡能否扮演一些更具體而有實際功用的角色——只有在佛教僧侶成爲中國人日常生活中不可或缺的一分子時，他們才能成功地融入此一社會。宗教儀式自然是梁武帝首先想到的一個點子：水陸法會、盂蘭盆齋、梁皇懺等等這些我們今天所熟悉的薦亡儀式，可說都是梁武帝一手設計出來、再交由佛教僧團來擔綱主持的[49]，

49 《佛祖統紀》卷33：「水陸齋，梁武帝夢神僧告之曰：六道四生受苦無量，何不作水陸大齋以拔濟之。帝以問諸沙門，無知之者。唯(寶)誌公勸帝，廣尋經論，必有因緣。帝即遣迎大藏，積日披覽，創立儀文，三年而後成。……天監四年二月十五日，就金山寺，依儀修設」(《大正新修大藏經・佛祖統紀》，49：2035：33，頁321)。

《佛祖統紀》卷37：「大同四年，帝幸同泰寺，設盂蘭盆齋」(《大正新修大藏經・佛祖統紀》，49：2035：37，頁351)。不過，梁武帝初行盂蘭盆齋時，其目的乃為供養佛僧，一直要到宋代以後，盂蘭盆齋才逐漸轉變成一種薦亡儀

而僧侶也自此逐漸在中國人的喪葬與薦亡儀式中穩穩占有一席之地。只是，梁武帝的這番設計也不免注定了日後佛教給予中國人的印象——一個趕經懺、做法事，專門照顧亡魂的宗教[50]。

(續)

式(《佛光大辭典》，4，頁3454)。有關盂蘭盆齋的後續發展，參見Stephen F. Teiser, *The Ghost Festival In Medieval China*(Princeton Univ. press, 1988).

《梁皇懺》凡十卷，是梁武帝為了超度其夫人郗氏所制作的慈悲道場懺法，其後也成為相當通行的薦亡儀式之一(《佛光大辭典》，5，頁4624)。

梁武帝這些儀式到底源自何處，由於歷經千餘年之久，儀式本身改變在所難免，我們今日實已無從得知。大致而言，原始佛教是不可能的，因為佛陀根本就不相信祭祀(法事)能產生任何功效，不過，後期的佛教雖有不少印度教的成分，尤其是儀式的部份，因此來自印度的可能性是有的。此外，可能也夾雜有道教的成分，我們可別忘了，道教一向重視儀式，而梁武帝對道教可是有相當研究的。相關研究詳見牧田諦亮，〈中國における民俗佛教成立の過程〉，〈水陸會小考〉，《中國近世佛教史研究》(京都，1957)，頁51-52，169-193。不過，牧田諦亮對於這些超度儀式乃創自梁武帝的說法表示懷疑，認為應當是唐宋以後才出現的。

50 這當然還得視佛教是否有一套死亡儀式理論來配合，以及中國民間社會對此一理論接受的程度而定，因此其過程自然是相當緩慢的。不過，如就日後發展的情況來看，佛教在這方面的經營顯然算是相當成功的，例如中國民間所熟悉的亡者的「七七齋」(俗稱「做七」)，其說法即來自佛教。其源頭則可上溯至劉宋時，孝武帝(454-464)寵妃殷淑儀死，三七設會，悉請僧人釋曇宗主持誦經(參見《大正新修大藏經・高僧傳》，50：2059：13，頁416；《宋書・始平孝敬王子鸞》，80，頁2063)。六世紀初，北魏靈太后父親胡國珍崇信佛教，死後，靈太后下詔在七七期間，為「設千僧齋，令七人出家，百日設萬人齋，二七人出家」(《魏書》，83：2，頁1834-1835)。其理論根據則可參見《梵網經》卷下四十八輕垢：「若父母兄弟死亡之日，應請法師講菩薩戒經，福資亡者，得見諸佛，生人天上。若不爾者，犯輕垢罪」(《大正新修大藏經・梵網經》，24:1484，頁1006)；「父母兄弟和上(尚)阿闍梨亡滅之日，及三七日乃至七七日，亦應讀誦講說大乘經律，齋會求福行來治生」(《大正新修大藏經・梵網經》，24:1484，頁1008)。有關這方面的研究，詳見道端良秀，〈中國人の死の觀念と佛教〉，《中國佛教思想史の研究》，頁66-69，110-118。趙翼在《陔餘叢考》卷32「七七」一文裡，將「做七」此一習俗出現的時間定在北魏，並據此推斷應該是源自於道教。至於梁武帝當時的法會，主要是針對眾生的超度，而非專為亡者經營。

今天當然有些佛教信徒對於這樣的一種「形象」不甚滿意，但是要曉得，未能「安身」，如何「立命」？僧團的形象再好，僧侶的修行再高超，終究不是泥塑菩薩，就算每天僅只「日中一食、食不過缽」，基本的生活需求終究還是節省不了的。換成是在魏晉南北朝與隋唐時期，也就是佛教全盛的時期，佛教僧侶自然不用憂心生計問題，梁武帝個人在位時就曾四次捨身同泰寺，捐獻的資財(加上共襄盛舉的貴族卿相)以億萬計，唐初的三階教從事各種各樣的社會慈善事業，正如今天台灣慈濟功德會的情況一樣，其龐大的財力也是依賴社會各階層源源不絕的捐

(續)

佛教儀式的喪禮與中國人日常生活關係之密切，可參考下面的一份資料。根據燕京大學在1930年出版的、有關中國河北省清河縣的調查報告中發現，87%的家庭、或者16歲以上人口之中的89%，都自稱是「佛教徒」，雖然研究者對此數據表示懷疑：「很多和宗教沒有關係的人，都稱自己為佛教徒，儘管他們對佛教教義毫無理解也不遵從佛教儀式，除了在喪禮時。」只是，從這段話看來，佛教儀式的喪禮的確是許多中國人對佛教認識的開始。參見張茂桂、林本炫，〈宗教的社會意象：一個知識社會學的課題〉，《民族學研究所集刊》，74，頁109。

儒家學者或強調儒家禮教思想的朝代，對此現象當然是極為不滿，後面會討論到朱熹對此事的批判，只是他也承認無濟於事。明太祖開國後，在整頓綱紀的理念下，頒布一系列禮制(大致上以《朱子家禮》為本)，並輔以強制的手段，雖曾收效一時，日久終究還是難以抵敵佛教在民間社會強大的滲透力。佛教在中國人喪葬儀式中所扮演的角色，可說是歷千年而屹立不移。嚴格說來，喪葬儀式除了照顧亡魂外，另外一個極其重要的作用則在撫慰生者。儒家一向秉持孔子「未知生，焉知死」的態度，對死後世界基本上缺乏思考的興趣，自然難以就此提出一套——對一般人而言——淺顯易明首尾一貫且具說服力的理論，更談不上落實到日常的喪葬儀式中，之所以無法與佛教爭奪此一市場實屬必然。有關明代喪葬習俗的研究，參見何淑宜，〈以禮化俗——晚明士紳的喪俗改革思想及其實踐〉，《新史學》，11：3(2000, 9)。

劉淑芬則從中古時期佛教僧侶自己的喪葬儀式(例如林葬、塔葬等)，探討對中國人喪葬儀式的影響。詳見劉淑芬，〈林葬——中古佛教露屍葬研究之一〉，《大陸雜誌》，96：1-3(1998)；〈石室瘞窟——中古佛教露屍葬研究之二〉，《大陸雜誌》，98：2-4(1999)；〈唐代俗人的塔葬〉，《燕京學報》，新七期。

獻而來。然而，從宋代開始，佛教的盛況已成爲過去，在外來的捐獻不足以餬口的情況下，僧院所幸還有趕經懺做法事的一條生路，這就不得不欽佩梁武帝的高瞻遠矚了[51]。

有趣的是，佛教僧侶這份照顧亡魂的事業，嚴格說來與佛陀的教誨其實是背道而馳的。因爲，就佛陀的教義來看，眾生死後輪迴的去向概依其生前本業而定——因果的機制並非任何的超度法事所能爲力。即使是印度人日常生活中的宗教儀式與咒術，佛陀都認爲只是些於「業」無補的癡想幻覺，無益於脫離苦海，更何況是牽涉到一生業報總結算的輪迴大事。因此，當佛陀弟子詢問他：印度人的死亡儀式裡請婆羅門繞行死者誦經，究竟是否有助於死者轉生善趣？會受到佛陀如此的反問自然不足爲奇[52]：

> 「投擲大有一人抱的石頭於水井，然後沿著水井周圍步行，誦唱：『石頭呀！浮起來吧』，則該石頭究竟會浮起來嗎？」
> 「不，絕不浮起來。」

---

51 參見牧田諦亮，《アジア佛教史・中國篇(II)——民眾の佛教》(東京，1976)，頁135-137，特別是討論佛事(法事)種類的一節，文中詳述二次大戰時南京某一寺院各種法事的價碼、焰口普渡的儀式，藉以說明「佛事已為寺院重要經濟來源之一」，中譯本詳見中村元等編，《中國佛教發展史(上)》(台北，1984)，頁503-510。
上引何淑宜〈以禮化俗〉一文中，也提到採取佛教儀式雖然花費甚昂，但是對僧尼而言，卻是「創造了極大的市場需求，……一種有利可圖的事業」。利之所至，競爭衝突在所難免，有些地區的寺院為了避免爭執傷害到僧侶「出世」的形象，於是劃分勢力範圍以求利益均沾，只是一旦分配不均或侵犯他人地盤，衝突還是難以避免，至於形象的問題當然也就顧不得了。《吳江志・風俗篇》即有一段有趣的記載：「凡僧寺各有房分，每房占定邑人戶若干，謂之門徒。凡修齋作福之類，他僧不得而預焉，私請私赴者，僧必興訟」。詳見何淑宜，〈以禮化俗〉，《新史學》，11：3，頁59-60。

52 渡邊照宏著，陳世昌譯，《佛教》(台北：協志出版社，1966)，頁69-70。《中阿含經》亦有類似的比喻，不過是在阿私羅天之子伽彌尼向佛陀問法的場合(《佛光大藏經・中阿含》，3：17，頁110)。

「為什麼呢？」

「石頭有下沈的性質所致。」

「與此同理。人類依據生涯中自己的行為，決定死後的命運，為他人所不能變更。」

其實，除了爲佛教僧侶爭取到照顧亡魂的事業外，梁武帝對中國佛教的影響顯然還不止於此。例如，根據《廣弘明集》卷十九的記載：

上(梁武帝)造十三種無盡藏，有放生布施二科。此藏利益已為無限，而每月齋會，復於諸寺施財施食。又別敕至到張文休，日往屠肆，命切鼎俎，即時救贖，濟免億數，以此為常。……文休既蒙嘉貸，未嘗暫息，日中或不得食，而足不得息，周遍京邑，行步如飛，擊鼓揚幢，負擔馳逐，家禽野獸，殫四生之品，無不放捨焉。是時朝臣至于民庶，並各隨喜(《大正新修大藏經‧廣弘明集》，52：2103：19，頁237)。

敘述的是梁武帝設置特定的庫藏以支應「布施」與「放生」兩項慈善事業所需。這裡的「布施」對象指的是寺院中的僧侶，基本上仍不脫原始布施的範疇，此處姑且置之不論。然而「放生」一項——尤其是到市場買禽獸來放生的「善舉」——卻成爲此後千餘年來中國人所熟悉的佛教信徒的行爲模式[53]，一直到目前的台灣依然如此。

53 「放生」的經典依據可參見《梵網經》：「若佛子以慈心故，行放生業。一切男子是我父，一切女人是我母。我生生無不從之受生，故六道眾生皆是我父母，而殺而食者，即殺我父母，亦殺我故身。一切地水是我先身，一切風火是我本體，故常行放生。……若見世人殺畜生時，應方便救護，解其苦難」。(《大正新修大藏經‧梵網經》，24：1484，頁1006)。相關研究詳見道端良秀，《中國佛教思想史の研究》，頁225-248。

對於他的佛教改革事業，梁武帝無疑是抱有極大的決心與期許的。也因此，當他對佛教僧團的改造工作逐步接近尾聲之際，我們發現他對外界針對佛教所提出的批判就表現得愈發敏感與不容忍。前面曾提到，在梁武帝下令禁斷僧團酒肉之前，參軍郭祖深曾上書抨擊時事，其中對於佛教的批評尤爲用力：

> 都下佛寺五百餘所，窮極宏麗。僧尼十餘萬，資產豐沃。所在郡縣，不可勝言。道人又有白徒，尼則皆畜養女，皆不貫人籍，天下戶口幾亡其半。而僧尼多非法，養女皆服羅紈，其蠹俗傷法，抑由於此。請精加檢括，若無道行，四十已下，皆使還俗附農。罷白徒養女，聽畜奴婢，婢唯著青布衣。僧尼皆令蔬食。如此，則法與俗盛，國富人殷。不然，恐方來處處成寺，家家剃落，尺土一人，非復國有(《南史・郭祖深》，70，頁1722)。

由於深知此一舉動大大觸犯梁武帝的忌諱，郭祖深在上書時還特別備好棺木(所謂「輿櫬詣闕上封事」)，以便隨時從容就義。只是，出乎意外的，梁武帝不但沒有處罰他，反而「嘉其正直，擢爲豫章鍾陵令，員外散騎常侍」；甚至日後的禁斷僧團酒肉一事，說不定也是從郭祖深的批評中——「僧尼皆令蔬食」一句話——得來的靈感。

然而，十餘年後同樣就佛教的問題提出抨擊、內容也不見得比郭祖深嚴厲了多少的荀濟，所遭逢的命運可就有天壤之別。根據《廣弘明集》所載：「書奏，梁武(帝)大怒，集朝士將加顯戮」，迫得荀濟只好從此亡命東魏[54]。前後相隔不過十餘年，爲何待遇卻是如此截然不同？

---

54 《大正新修大藏經・廣弘明集》，52：2103：7，頁128-131。有關郭祖深與荀濟的事蹟，詳見湯用彤，《漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史》，頁480-482。郭祖深上書應當在西元520年左右，荀濟的上書當在東魏成立(534)之後，故兩者相去約有十餘年。

其間的關鍵就在於：經過這一段時期的改革，在梁武帝看來，佛教應該已經能為國人所接受，因此，若再有批評無疑就是惡意的詆毀與攻訐，他覺得似乎再也沒有忍受的必要。

四、新素食觀的風行

梁武帝是成功的，具體表現當然是中國佛教僧團的徹底素食化。不過，他對中國社會的影響並不止於此，由於新素食觀深入人心，更由於佛教僧團全面素食，素食在中國社會已被神聖化，或者說，已成為一種宗教資質的判準。這使得以後想要在中國這塊宗教市場上爭取信徒的教派，都面臨了素食與否的挑戰，正如當年發生在印度社會的情況一樣。

首先採取行動的是道教徒。前面曾提到過，南北朝時期其實還是有不少道士在新素食觀的影響下終身持素的，只是這樣的一種行為始終只限於個別的道士(或者再加上門徒)，陸修靜就是個著名的例子，此外如梁武帝時代的東鄉宗超：

> 東鄉宗超，字逸倫……幼而離俗，不涉婚宦……日中而餐，餐止麻麥……乃捨所居舊宅為希玄道觀……梁武帝三教兼弘，制皆菜食。雖有詔敕，罕能遵用。逸倫奉行，於是館中法眾，莫不菜蔬。私有犯觸，即加斥遣。乃至廚醮不血味，遠近嗟稱，獨為清素也(陳國符，《道藏源流考・道學傳輯佚》，頁472)。

梁武帝雖然力行不殺生戒，國家祭典皆不許用牲，天監十二年(513)甚至下令禁止京都附近一帶(丹陽瑯琊)的漁獵活動[55]，然而上述引文中

---

55 梁武帝，〈斷殺絕宗廟犧牲詔(并表請)〉，詳見《大正新修大藏經・廣弘明集》，52:2103:26，頁293-294。

「三教(儒釋道)兼弘，制皆菜食」恐怕還非他力所能及。不過，從這一段記載我們也可以得知梁武帝當時禁斷佛教僧團酒肉對道教的確帶來相當大的衝擊，道士起而效法自不足爲奇。照東鄉宗超的傳記看來，他的生活模式已幾乎是完全以佛教僧侶爲典範(獨身、素食)。可惜的是，這樣的理想終究還是只能行之於他自己的道館內，而無法擴展成一種全面性的運動。

崛起於十二世紀下半葉的華北而有「新道教」之稱的全真教，也有類似的改革，因爲全真教的創始人王重陽(1113-1170)，其實也是以仿效佛教的出家——長住道觀、獨身、素食——作爲改革道教的第一步[56]。不過，王重陽在道教史上的地位比起東鄉宗超可是重要得多了，因爲他的幾個弟子，例如馬丹陽、丘處機等都是非常傑出的宗教家，全真教也因此一度成爲華北地區最興盛的道教教團，延續至今仍爲道教最主要教派之一。只是，儘管王重陽的努力確曾取得一時的成功，一般世人對道士的認識並沒有因此而清晰起來：因爲，有的道士固然是居觀獨身持素，有的卻仍是娶妻生子葷酒不拘。換言之，整個道士教團並沒有一個統一而確定的生活樣式，在此情況下，道士的身分與形象無法像佛教僧侶一樣成功地被塑造出來，自也不足爲奇。

爲何道士教團無法整體一致地——就像佛教僧團一樣——服膺於一個統一的生活規範？這點牽涉到中國道教本身的分歧性——不管是在經典還是在組織上。就拿全真教來說好了，就算是在華北，其他小教派仍然持續存在，而且不管是在教義經典或禮儀規範上也還堅持自己原有的傳承，全真教對此都無能爲力，更別提遠在正一教盛行的南方了。正一教傳自江西龍虎山張天師一系(又稱龍虎宗)，世代相襲，根本就談不上出家，與北方的全真教自然是南轅北轍。可是它們卻都同屬道教的一支，而且不管是民間故事稗官野史，一提到請道士驅鬼捉妖，出場的總

56 《中華文化通志・道教志》(上海，1998)，頁90-92：159

是張天師。雖然這是因爲道教有鍊養派與符籙科儀派之分，卻適足以混淆世人對道教的認識，而其身分自然也就很難取得一致的認同[57]。因此，就本文探討的角度來看，「道士」與其說是一種「身分」，毋寧說是一種「職業」或許還更貼切些[58]。由於道教的問題並非本文主旨所在，我們就討論到這裡。

不管怎麼說，全真教對素食的提倡還是很堅持的。一直到今天爲止，只要還承認自己是隸屬於全真教系統的道觀，道士基本上仍必須遵守長住道觀獨身持素等種種清規，佛教的影響於此清晰可見。日本學者吉岡義豐在二次大戰期間(1940-1946)，曾對北京西郊的白雲觀作過長期的田野調查，眾所周知，白雲觀歷史悠久，是全真教龍門派祖庭，目前則是中國道教協會所在地[59]。根據他的實地觀察，道觀對觀中道士獨身持素的清規的確非常堅持：道士不准夜不歸宿、吃葷飲酒，違者逐出道觀，連不假外出都要受罰[60]。吉岡義豐也承認，雖然白雲觀的素食名聞北京，觀中一般道士日常的伙食卻相當粗糙，初食者的確不易適應[61]。只是，由於素食乃至獨身在道教本身並沒有得到一致性的認同——換言之，當社會上一般人對於道士究竟是否應該素食仍處於沒有定見的情況下，即使是全真教的道士，在偶然的一些場合裡，對於新素食觀的堅持有時也不免會有所讓步。吉岡義豐在同一調查裡也有如下的

57 《中華文化通志·道教志》，頁203-4。

58 此處所謂「身分」與「職業」的不同主要在於：作為一個「身分團體」的一分子有其一致的生活樣式(Lebensfuehrung)，而從事某一「職業」的人則不一定須要一種共同的生活樣式。

59 白雲觀原名天長觀，建於唐玄宗年間(713-755)，元初長春眞人丘處機受封國師之後即長駐於此，丘處機為王重陽弟子，全眞教龍門派開山祖師。道觀於明初改名白雲觀。

60 《中華文化通志·道教志》，頁161。

61 Yoshitoyo Yoshioka(吉岡義豐), "Taoist Monastic Life," *Facets of Taoism*(New Haven, 1979), pp. 240-241, 247. 原文詳見，吉岡義豐，〈永生への願い〉，《吉岡義豐著作集》第四卷(東京，1989)，頁1-159。

記載：

當我在北京時，只要一有空就造訪白雲觀，而且可以隨意逗留。主持安世霖也曾到北京拜訪我。記得他第一次來訪時，我有點猶豫要如何招待一位只吃素的道士，最後只好直截了當地問他：「魚和肉能吃嗎？」「在道觀裡，我們嚴守清規，外出時就比較有彈性。有時候，道士必須要離觀出差半個月或甚至一個月，要是仍然堅持素食(精進料理)，萬一找不到合適的食堂，豈不是要餓死。就算只是來城裡一天，由於找一家素食館子並不容易，豈不是得整天都沒得吃。平心而論，離開道觀外出後，想要嚴守清規是不可能的。」而對他這麼坦然的陳述，我不禁為自己的愚蠢的教條主義深感自責[62]。

不管怎麼說，十二世紀末從道教內部進行的改革運動，還是具體說明了新素食觀以及梁武帝所重新塑造出來的佛教僧團對中國社會的強大衝擊。其實，早在全真教之前，中國境內已經出現過一些以素食聞名於當時的民間宗教，更重要的是，這些教派對素食的要求是及於教派全體成員的(包括教士與信徒)，而我們曉得，即使是佛教與全真教，素食的戒律基本上也僅止於其僧侶和道士，對於一般信徒則還是處於道德勸說的階段。這些以素食爲號召的新興教派到底起源於何時，史無明言，不過，最早見之於史料的是後梁貞明六年(920)的一段記載：

陳州(河南淮陽)末尼黨類立毋乙為天子，發兵討之。生擒毋乙，餘黨械送闕下，斬於都市。初陳州里俗喜習左道，依浮圖

62 Yoshitoyo Yoshioka, "Taoist Monastic Life," *Facets of Taoism*, p. 248.〈永生への願い〉，《吉岡義豐著作集》第四卷，頁129。

之教，自立一宗，號上上乘。不食葷茹，誘化庸民，糅雜淫穢，宵集晝散。因刺史惠王友能動多不法，由是妖賊嘯聚，累討未平，及貞明中，誅斬方盡。後唐石晉時，復潛興(《大正新修大藏經．大宋僧史略》，54：2126：3，頁253)。

到了宋代，類似的「不食葷茹，宵集晝散」的教派宛如雨後春筍般紛紛在江南一帶出現。官方原先對這些新興教派並沒有太大的興趣，僅將之視爲一般的民間信仰，一直要等到北宋宣和二年(1120)方臘在江浙一帶起事，有不少這類教派的信徒參與，這才引起政府的注意，而地方官員也開始上報他們的動靜：

(宣和二年)十一月四日，臣僚言：溫州等狂悖之人，自稱明教，號為行者。今來，明教行者各於所居鄉村，建立屋宇，號為齋堂。如溫州共有四十餘處並是私建無名額佛堂。每年正月內，取歷中密日聚集侍者、聽者、姑婆、齋姊等人，建設道場。鼓扇愚民男女，夜聚曉散(《宋會要輯稿》〈刑法〉，2-78)。

引文中的「明教」即以前的摩尼教(或作「末尼」)。只是當時並無法令可以取締這些新興教派的信徒，尚書省遂於宣和三年(1121)閏五月七日上書：

契勘江浙喫菜事魔之徒，習以成風。自來雖有禁止傳習妖教刑賞，既無止絕喫菜事魔之文。即州縣監司不為禁止，民間無由告捕，遂致事魔之人聚眾山谷。一日竊發，倍費經畫。若不重立禁約，即難以止絕，乞修立條，從之(《宋會要輯稿．刑法》，2-81)。

爲了有效遏阻這些教派勢力的擴張，宋代官方的確是從重量刑：

> 諸喫菜事魔或夜聚曉散、傳習妖教者絞，從者配三千里，婦女千里編管。託幻變術者減一等，皆配千里，婦人五百里編管。情赦不順者絞。以上不以赦降原減。情理重者奏裁。非傳習妖教，流三千里。許人捕至死。財產備賞，有餘沒官。其本非徒侶而被誑惑，不曾傳授他人者，各減二等(《宋會要輯稿・刑法》，2-112)。

引的雖然是南宋紹興年間的敕令，應該只是重申宣和年間的舊律，想來不致有太大的出入。

這是「喫菜事魔」一詞首見於官方文書。「事魔」自然是統治者的污蔑，因爲古今中外沒有一個教派會自稱爲「邪教」或「魔教」、並承認自己所信仰的對象是「惡魔」[63]。不過，這個「魔」字指的究竟是不是摩尼教的創始人摩尼(Mani)，我們一時似乎也還無法給個確切的答案[64]。姑且不論這些教派的信仰內容如何，當時人們所能確認的是：這些新興教派是以「素食」(喫菜)爲號召、且其信徒普遍禁絕酒肉，聚會

63 其實這些教派的信徒有的是自稱為「道民」的：
嘉泰二年(1202)，白雲菴沈智元自稱道民，進狀乞額。臣寮言：道民者，喫菜事魔，所謂姦民者也(《大正新修大藏經・佛祖統紀》，49：2035：54，頁475)。
浙右有所謂道民，實喫菜事魔之流，而竊自託於佛老，以掩物議。既非僧道，又非童行，輒於編户之外，別為一族。姦淫行穢甚於常人，而以屏妻孥斷葷酒為戒法。貪冒貨賄甚於常人，而以建祠廟修橋樑為功行。一鄉一聚，各有魁宿。平居暇日，公為結集，曰燒香，曰燃燈，曰設齋，曰誦經，千百為群，倏聚忽散(《宋會要輯稿・刑法》，2-130)。

64 自從王國維發表〈摩尼教流行中國考〉一文以來，摩尼教(明教)、方臘之亂與宋代的「喫菜事魔黨徒」之間的關係，就一直是史學界爭論不休的問題。有關此一問題，比較新且全面性的探討，詳見王見川，《從摩尼教到明教》(台北：新文豐，1992)。

的方式則是「夜聚曉散」。這也成爲後來官方取締的最重要依據。從史實來看，自從方臘起事後，所謂的「喫菜事魔之徒」似乎就一直是宋代地方治安上相當頭痛的問題，以至於在當時的官方文書、私人筆記裡都留下了不少的記錄。爲何這些以素食爲號召的教派會成爲宋代治安的問題？其間的因素自然是相當複雜的。不過，由於這個問題並非本文主旨所在，而且相關研究也甚多，這裡就不再贅述。

不管怎麼說，照史料看來我們所能確認的一點——這也是本文的重點——是：從五代以來，在中原地區已出現了相當數量的、長期持齋的信徒，到了宋代，這種風氣更蔓延到江南和福建一帶，並形成當時政府的一大困擾。這些在當時文獻裡被統稱爲「喫菜事魔」的信徒到底是屬於那些教派？關於這一點，宋代佛教史家宗鑑的《釋門正統》與志磐的《佛祖統紀》或許可以提供給我們一些線索。

> 嘗考《夷堅志》云：喫菜事魔，三山尤熾。為首者紫帽寬衫，婦人黑冠白服，稱為明教會，所事佛衣白(《大正新修大藏經・佛祖統紀》，49：2035：48，頁431)。
>
> 末尼火祆者，初，波斯國有蘇魯支，行火祆教，弟子來化中國。……梁貞明六年，陳州末尼反，立毋乙為天子，朝廷發兵禽斬之。其徒以不茹葷飲酒，夜聚婬穢，畫魔王踞坐，佛為洗足。云佛止大乘，我乃上上乘(《大正新修大藏經・佛祖統紀》，49：2035：54，頁474)。
>
> 白雲菜者，(宋)徽宗大觀(1107-1110)間，西京寶應寺僧孔清覺居杭(州)之白雲菴，立四果十地，造論數篇，教於流俗，亦曰十地菜。……有司流恩州。嘉泰二年(1202)，白雲菴沈智元自稱道民，進狀乞額。臣寮言：道民者，喫菜事魔，所謂姦民者也(《大正新修大藏經・佛祖統紀》，49：2035：54，頁474-475)。

> 宋高宗紹興(1131-1162)初，吳郡延祥院僧茅子元，初學於梵法主，依放(天)台宗出圓融四土圖。……勸諸男女同修淨業。自稱白蓮導師，坐受眾拜。謹蔥乳，不殺，不飲酒，號白蓮菜。受其邪教者，謂之傳道。與之通淫者，謂之佛法。……有論於有司者，正以事魔之罪，流於江州。然其餘黨效習，至今為盛(《大正新修大藏經・佛祖統紀(引自釋門正統)》，49：2035：47，頁425)。
>
> 良渚(宗鑑)曰：此三者皆假名佛教，以誑愚俗，猶五行之有沴氣也。今摩尼尚扇於三山，而白蓮白雲處處有習之者。大氐不事葷酒，故易於裕足。不殺物命，故近於為善。愚民無知，皆樂趨之，故其黨不勸而自盛(《大正新修大藏經・佛祖統紀》，49：2035：54，頁475)。

文章中極盡攻訐詆毀之能事。這也難怪，因爲不管是白蓮宗、還是白雲宗，打出的旗號都是佛教，吸引信徒的手段也不外乎「素食、不殺生」等等，作爲一個正統的佛教信徒(宗鑑與志磐)，在市場競爭的原則下，自然是無法忍受，所謂「惡紫之奪朱」大概就是這個意思。宗鑑甚至還想訴諸政治及社會的壓力，除了給這些素食主義的信徒加上「喫菜事魔」的惡名外，還大聲疾呼：「以修懺念佛爲名，而實通姦穢，有識士夫宜加禁止」(雖說「修懺念佛、素食與不殺生」本來就是佛教一貫的訴求)。不過，從他們氣急敗壞的抨擊、以及他們一再強調「其黨日盛」的說辭看來，這些教派顯然已對當時的正統佛教構成了莫大的威脅[65]。

---

65 除了《佛祖統紀》中列舉的這三個教派外，根據王見川的研究，當時還有所謂「金剛禪」、「二會子」、「白佛」等佛教異端團體，應該才是「喫菜事魔」的主要構成分子。詳見王見川，《從摩尼教到明教》，頁234-258。

不過，宗鑑將摩尼教與白雲宗、白蓮宗一律列爲佛教異端(「假名佛教」)顯然是有問題的。白雲與白蓮宗的開山始祖固然出自佛教，摩尼教卻是個如假包換的外來宗教，而且——更有意思的是——他們從一開始就是個強調素食的宗教[66]。

根據史料，波斯人摩尼於西元三世紀中葉創摩尼教，他的戒律中有所謂的「五令」和「三封」。「五令」指的是：「尊敬聖靈，樂於齋戒、祈求和施捨」；「樂於遵守不說謊、不殺生、不吃肉的律則」；「樂於遵守潔淨、安貧的律則」；「尊敬謙讓、仁慈」。「三封」則是：口封，手封和胸封。所謂的「口封」是：禁止褻瀆言語、吃肉和飲酒。「手封」是：禁止僧侶從事耕田、收穫和殺害任何動植物的事情。「胸封」是指禁止性交之事，因爲性交被視爲是惡魔通姦的模仿，會導致物質的生殖。

嚴格說來，這些戒律與古印度的傳統「五戒」實相去不遠。不過，移居印度的雅利安人本來就與移入波斯的雅利安人同樣來自高加索一帶，擁有類似的倫理觀應當也是意料中事[67]。再說，摩尼本人也曾經拜訪過印度，親身體驗到當時印度社會強調不殺生與素食的宗教價值實亦不足爲奇[68]。只是，這裡我們要強調的是：摩尼教固然有如此的戒律，其對象卻僅只限於僧侶階層。因爲，如果一般人也完全遵守這些規定，則無疑會導致人類全體的餓死及滅絕。因此，這些規定只適用於摩尼教中的出家者(僧侶)，而不及於一般信徒。一般信徒所要遵守的只是下列的十誡：一、不拜偶像，二、不謊語，三、不貪，四、不殺，五、不淫，六、不盜，七、不行邪道巫術，八、不二見(懷疑)，九、不惰，十、每日四時(或七時)祈禱。

---

66 王見川，《從摩尼教到明教》，頁110-112。

67 參見高楠順次郎、木村泰賢著，高觀廬譯，《印度哲學宗教史》(台北：商務，1971)，頁6-10。

68 王見川，《從摩尼教到明教》，頁79。

摩尼死後(277)，摩尼教開始往東方傳教，而在唐高宗時(650-683)傳入中國。安史之亂後，由於一些歷史機緣的巧合，摩尼教一度成爲回紇人的國教[69]。《九姓回鶻可汗碑》第八行記錄如下：

> 而受明教，熏血異俗，化為蔬飯之鄉，宰殺邦家，變為勸善之國。

這個碑文當然是有點誇張。因爲，回紇爲游牧民族，要他們完全採取素食可不是件容易的事。再說，摩尼教除了納入選民的僧侶階層外，本來也並不要求一般信徒持素。不過，由此碑的記載，我們大致亦可了解他們對素食的重視。

隨著回紇人勢力的消退，唐武宗在西元843年藉著滅佛的機會一併消滅摩尼教。根據史書所載：

> 武宗會昌三年(843)，敕天下摩尼寺並廢入宮。京城女摩尼七十二人死。及在此國迴紇諸摩尼等配流諸道，死者大半(《大正新修大藏經・大宋僧史略》，54：2126：3，頁253)。
> (會昌三年)四月中旬敕，令煞(殺)天下摩尼師，剃髮、令著袈裟作沙門形而煞之。摩尼師即迴鶻所崇重也(圓仁，《入唐求法巡禮行記》，3，頁91)。

摩尼教此後在中國歷史上即暫告銷聲匿跡。然而，等到它再度出現時，卻已是個信徒全面素食——相對於以前只有僧侶階層素食——的教派，而且被列入「喫菜事魔」的行列。這就是歷史上鼎鼎有名的明教。由於出身背景與白雲宗、白蓮宗的不同，我們認爲摩尼教的素食應該是

69 王見川，《從摩尼教到明教》，頁119-170。

有其歷史淵源的，不過，它之所以走上全面素食的道路則可能與當時中國的特殊環境有關。

新素食觀之所以盛行，佛教的不殺生戒當然是扮演了啓動的角色。然而，除此之外，我們也可別忘了當時中國一般物資條件的配合。這裡所謂的「物資條件」其實就是當時中國社會的相對匱乏的現象。

除了少數幾個被視爲「太平盛世」的時期外，歷史上的中國基本上是個貧窮的國家，呈現在日常生活上就是肉食的匱乏。對於生活在當今富裕社會的人來說，或許很難想像「一肉難求」的時代。只是這樣的時代確曾在中國歷史上存在過(游牧地區除外)，而且還持續了相當長久的時間。實際上，不管台灣還是中國大陸，大概都一直要到最近代才算勉強擺脫了這個命運——或許也還不及於整個中國大陸地區。也就是在這樣的條件下，宗鑑才會說：「不事葷酒，故易於裕足」。更詳盡的說明則來自南宋高宗時的起居舍人王居正。王居正在紹興四年(1143)曾就「喫菜事魔」黨徒爲何始終無法根絕一事提出自己的看法：

> 伏見兩浙州縣，有喫菜事魔之俗。……臣聞事魔者每鄉或村，有一二桀黠者，謂之魔頭。盡錄其鄉村之人姓氏名字，相與詛盟，為事魔之黨。凡事魔者不肉食，而一家有事，同黨之人皆出力以相賑卹。蓋不食肉則費省，故易足。同黨則相親，相親故相恤，而事易濟。民愚無知，以魔頭之說為皆可信，而爭趨歸之。此所以法禁愈嚴而愈不可勝禁(李心傳，《建炎以來繫年要錄》，卷76，頁3-5)。

除了指出宗教可以提供給信眾一種共同體意識外(「同黨則相親，相親故相恤，而事易濟」)，還特別說明「不食肉則費省，故易足」。摩尼教或許也就是在這樣的一個環境下，才會決定將其素食的主張貫徹到一般的信徒。就此而言，南宋中葉李守謙在〈戒事魔詩〉裡所說的

「肉味魚腥喫不妨」，就不免充滿了反諷的味道[70]。

類似的物資條件一直到五、六百年後，西方傳教士開始踏足中國時，仍沒有太大的變化。法國史家布勞代爾(F. Braudel)就曾在其名著《15至18世紀的物質文明、經濟和資本主義》(第一卷)裡以「肉食者的歐洲」一辭，來形容歷史上歐洲人所能享用的肉食分量普遍要遠超過中國、印度、日本與中東一帶的民眾。根據他的敘述：

> 中國人吃肉很少。幾乎沒有為屠宰而飼養的家畜。……拉斯戈台斯神父說，這些為數不多的動物不能滿足一個天性愛食肉的民族(指歐洲人)的需要。除了蒙古人習慣吃煮羊肉，中國人吃肉總要加點別的東西。肉切成能一口吞下的小塊，有時甚至剁成餡，作為「菜」的配料使用。按照傳統，中國人吃飯時有許多小盒裝「菜」，其中的魚或肉配著蔬菜，佐以醬油和其他調料。不管這種烹調事實上多麼講究，多麼精打細算，它還是叫歐洲人吃驚：在歐洲人眼裡它仍是太少了。拉斯戈台斯神父寫道：即使有錢人，也不過「好像只是為了增加食欲才夾幾塊豬肉、雞肉或別的肉吃……不管他們多麼有錢，地位有多高，他們消費的肉食為數甚微。如果他們像我們歐洲人一樣吃肉，他們擁有的各種肉食無論如何不夠他們的需要……會把整個國家吃窮的」。那不勒斯人熱梅利．卡勒里曾從廣州到北京又從北京回廣州穿行中國，1696年(康熙三十五年)他對客店供應的素菜大為惱火，按他的口味這些菜索然寡味。他不得不在宿處附近和在集市上碰運氣另購食物：雞、蛋、野雞、兔子、火腿、山鶉……。1735年(雍正十三年)左右，一位歐洲觀察家斷定：「中國人很少大塊吃肉」。他接著說：「他們因而只用很少的

70 李守謙的詩詳見王見川，《從摩尼教到明教》，頁243-244。

> 土地來飼養家畜」。四十年以後，一位在北京工作的傳教士說得更加明確：「歐洲近代哲學家們沒有想到人口過多帶來的種種不便和後果」，而人口過多卻迫使中國人「不養牛羊，因為供牛羊生活的土地必需用來養活人」。於是「田裡缺少肥料，飯桌上缺少肉，打仗缺少馬」，「為收獲同等數量的糧食需要付出更多的勞動，使用更多的人」。他總結說：「相對而言，法國與中國的養牛數量至少為十比一」[71]。

就此而言，我們或許可以重新回頭思考當初梁武帝禁斷僧團酒肉之得以成功的因素。換言之，以中國南北朝當時的物資條件來看，即使梁武帝統治的時期大致上算得上是個盛世，當年在京城建康的僧團裡，恐怕也只有極少數高階的僧侶能有較多的機會享用肉食。其他地區的僧團想來亦是如此。這也是爲何梁武帝決定要處罰違反禁止酒肉戒律的僧侶時：「唯取老舊者，最多門徒者，此二種人最宜先問，何以故？治一無行小僧，不足以改革物心，治如是一大僧，足以驚動視聽。」其實，除了打蒼蠅不如打老虎的效果外，更重要的原因則是——要逮到一般小僧犯戒飲酒吃肉的機會並不容易。既然僧團中大多數的僧侶平時皆已習於素食，梁武帝要求禁斷酒肉，他們可是找不出反對的理由。梁武帝顯然也已洞悉其中奧妙，所以才會在第二次集會時，特別針對一些大德高僧施予震撼教育，因爲只有他們，才是真正須要警告的一群。

不管怎麼說，儘管宋代官方不斷的鎮壓與污名化，這些以素食爲號召的新興教派還是堅強地存活了下來。而且，除了摩尼教(明教)、白蓮教、白雲宗外，舉凡此後由中國土壤自發性產生、或由上述教派衍伸發

---

71 詳見Fernand Braudel, *The Structures of Everyday Life: Civilization & Capitalism, 15th-18th Century*, vol. 1 (New York, 1981), pp. 199-200; 中譯本見顧良、施康強譯，《15至18世紀的物質文明、經濟和資本主義》第一卷（北京，1992），頁230-231。

展出來的民間宗教，例如羅教(齋教)、一貫道等等，幾乎無一例外皆以素食為號召。雖然這些宗教基本上都沒有出家眾的團體，對素食究竟堅持到什麼程度可能也都還有疑問，新素食觀的風靡天下確已是個不爭的事實。

本土性的宗教團體幾乎清一色地向佛教靠攏，以佛教僧團的生活規範為其學習對象，作為中國社會最主要身分團體的儒家士人又是如何看待此一現象？儒釋道三家的爭論綿延已有一千五百年以上，可說是中國思想史上最重要課題之一，相關論述算得上汗牛充棟，這裡就不再贅述。我們還是回到佛教僧團的生活樣式(出家與素食)、特別是素食的問題來談。

從儒家的倫理來看，出家乃是無君無父的行為，而且「不孝有三，無後為大」，因此完全沒有商量的餘地，唯一可以容忍的大概只有年老出家，就像印度婆羅門的想法一樣。至於素食的問題，在〈潔淨、身分與素食〉一文裡，筆者曾提到過，儒家原本即有素食的規定，只不過是局限在齋戒的場合，因此，對於佛教徒大事宣傳「肉食即殺生，素食即慈悲」、等於將素食無限上綱的做法，自然是大不以為然。在儒家看來，除了人類之外，其他眾生(包括所有動植物)存在的唯一價值就是供給人類利用——不管是提供食物、能源或勞動力。遵照的還是——坦白說——弱肉強食的基本原則，正如《摩奴法論》所言：「不動物為動物之食，無牙者為有牙者之食，無手者為有手者之食，膽小者為膽大者之食」(5：29，頁93)。當然，人類也不會愚蠢到採取竭澤而漁的手段，所謂的「厚生利用」就是儒家對待眾生的基本態度，「數罟不入洿池，魚鱉不可勝食也；斧斤以時入山，材木不可勝用也」，孟子梁惠王篇的這句話可說是此一辭彙最好的解釋。平心而論，這也是幾乎所有——除了堅持不殺生戒的印度人之外——民族的共通態度。宋代理學家朱熹(1130-1200)對佛教的一段評論最能代表儒家上述的觀點：

釋老稱其有見，只是見得箇空虛寂滅。眞是虛，眞是寂無處，不知他所謂見者見箇甚底？莫親於父子，卻棄了父子；莫重於君臣，卻絕了君臣；以至民生彝倫之間不可闕者，它一皆去之。所謂見者見箇甚物？且如聖人「親親而仁民，仁民而愛物」；他卻不親親，而劃地要仁民愛物。愛物時，也則是食之有時，用之有節；見生不忍見死，聞聲不忍食肉；如仲春之月，犧牲無用牝，不麛，不卵，不殺胎，不覆巢之類，如此而已。他則不食肉，不茹葷，以至投身施虎，此是何理？（《朱子語類》，126，頁3014）

在討論鬼神之事時，他曾說了段故事，其中也稍稍開了素食一個小玩笑，藉以說明徹底素食之不可行，尤其是在宗教祭祀的場合：

蜀中灌口二郎廟，當初是李冰因開離堆有功，立廟。今來現許多靈怪，乃是他第二兒子出來。初間封為王，後來（宋）徽宗好道，謂他是甚麼眞君，遂改封為眞君。向張魏公（浚）用兵禱於其廟，夜夢神語云：「我向來封為王，有血食之奉，故威福用得行。今號為『眞君』，雖尊，凡祭我以素食，無血食之養，故無威福之靈。今須復我封為王，當有威靈」。魏公遂乞復其封。不知魏公是有此夢，還復一時用兵，托為此說。今逐年人户賽祭，殺數萬來頭羊，廟前積骨如山，州府亦得此一項稅錢。利路又有梓潼神，極靈。今二箇神似乎割據了兩川。大抵鬼神用生物祭者，皆是假此生氣為靈。古人釁鐘、釁龜，皆此意（《朱子語類》，3，頁53）。

他的弟子王過也批評過當時士大夫流行請僧侶作法事的習俗，重點還是擱在祖先「血食」與否的問題，這應該也是朱熹的觀點：

(王)過每論士大夫家忌日用浮屠誦經追薦，鄙俚可怪。既無此理，是使其先不血食也(《朱子語類》，90，頁2322)。

有趣的是，儘管朱熹本人對佛教毫無好感，有時甚至激烈到主張「釋老之學盡當毀廢」[72]。然而，對於素食的問題，他始終沒有提出正面的抨擊，他的批評嚴格說來實在是軟弱無力的，只能在祭祀一類的事務上發出微弱的抗議之聲。其中的因素在於：除非他肯訴諸赤裸裸的「弱肉強食」的原則，否則面對「肉食即殺生，殺生則傷慈」的指控，實在是無招架之力，這似乎也是所有自命爲「文明」的人所面臨的窘境。然而，要朱熹這樣的儒家信徒放棄自己的堅持，轉而接受佛教全面不殺生素食的主張，卻也有其實際爲難之處。

因爲，第一，這牽涉到宗教信仰的問題，也就是儒家所堅持的祖先血食——包括國家祭典裡獻祭太牢、少牢——與否的問題；其次是，素食乃至獨身，對中國佛教僧侶而言，實關係到他們的「身分」問題。正如我們在〈潔淨、身分與素食〉一文裡討論印度人的素食時所提到的，印度人是否採取素食主要得看他們各自確認的「身分」而定，「如果某個地區裡面素食者與婆羅門之間的競爭並不明顯的話，或者是有些婆羅門自己已接受某種比較低下的地位的話，他們就會吃肉」。反之，爲了維持身分的尊貴，就必須吃素。因此，只有「徹底素食的婆羅門」才會被承認爲「最尊貴的婆羅門」[73]。中國佛教僧侶的「身分」也是按照這樣一套邏輯掙來的。就此而言，當新素食觀在中國民間社會已取得普遍認同時，儒家的士人團體如果還想要維持其在中國社會原有的優勢地位(包括精神思想層面的領導甚至是壟斷的地位)，採取跟進的方式似乎不

72 《朱子語類》，125，頁3005。

73 Louis Dumont, *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications*(Chicago, 1980); 中譯本見，杜蒙著，王志明譯，《階序人——卡斯特體系及其衍生現象》(台北：遠流，1992)，頁227、455。

失爲一條可行之策，也才有可與佛教教團互相競爭的本錢。問題是中國的士人團體所面臨的問題要遠比印度的婆羅門更爲複雜。單只素食不殺生、甚至戒酒都還好商量，因爲儒家本來也有節制飲食的規範。然而，要不要同樣爲了競爭，也效法僧侶遵守獨身的戒律？遵守的話，傳宗接代怎麼辦？「不孝有三，無後爲大」可是儒家自古以來最重要的明訓之一。此外，是否也學僧侶一樣，拒絕出仕以示遠離紅塵？是的話，那儒家所謂「士以天下爲己任」的抱負到底還維不維持？換言之，儒家安身立命的基礎本來跟佛教就是南轅北轍的。

其實，就算士人團體既戒酒肉、又禁絕女色，做到像佛教僧團一樣「超凡入聖」的境界，也沒有可能取代僧侶而成爲一般社會大眾在精神、乃至靈魂上的「導師」。這並不是說儒家的士人團體無法擔當起指導眾人的責任，事實遠非如此，在俗世社會的日常生活、家族人倫規範乃至經國治世的事務上，士人團體在中國社會擔綱扮演「作之師」的角色，至少已有兩千年以上的歷史。只是，儒家關注的是現世，在「未知生焉知死」、「敬鬼神而遠之」等等孔老夫子的明訓下，士人團體對於彼世，原則上是採取存而不論的態度。正如德國社會學者韋伯(Max Weber)在《中國的宗教》一書裡所說的：「無論如何，儒教總是瀰漫著一股絕對的不可知論以及根本上的否定氣氛，反對任何對於彼世的冀望」[74]，「儒教倫理中並沒有救贖的觀念。儒教徒當然沒有被『拯救』的慾望：不管是從(佛教)靈魂的輪迴，還是從(基督教)彼世的懲罰當中被拯救。這兩個觀念都是爲儒教所不知的。儒教徒無意於棄絕生命的救贖，因爲生命是被肯定的；也無意於擺脫社會現世的救贖，因爲社會現世是既有而被接受的。他只想透過自制而謹慎地掌握住此世的種種機運。他沒有從(基督教徒式的)原罪或人的墮落中——這是他所不知的——被拯救出來的渴望。他希望被拯救的，沒有別的，或許只有無尊嚴可

74 韋伯著，簡惠美譯，《中國的宗教：儒教與道教》，頁227。

言的粗野不文。只有侵害到作爲社會基本義務的恭順時，才構成儒教徒的『罪』」[75]。在此限制下，儒家根本就不可能發展出一套首尾一貫、言之成理的觀念來解釋彼世——有關生死、輪迴乃至鬼神——的一切，遠比不上佛教在這方面的優而爲之。就此而言，即使是多方抄襲佛教理論的道教，至少也還有個「成仙之道」可以提供給世人對彼世的一份憧憬與幻想。

在〈古代印度的王權觀念〉一文裡，杜蒙曾對古代印度種姓秩序裡、剎帝利與婆羅門的關係，或更具體的說，君主與祭司階層的關係——因爲剎帝利與婆羅門的關係，無疑是以君主與祭司的關係爲其典範——作過一個扼要的說明：

> (印度)宗教精神原則與王權原則之間的關係可從一個制度獲得完全的了解，這個制度把此關係具體呈現為人與人的關係，把抽象的理念相當完整的表現出來。國王不只是要雇請婆羅門從事公共祭儀，他還必須與某一個婆羅門建立起固定的、私人的關係，這個婆羅門即是國王的王家祭師(purohita, 字面意思是「在其前面者」)。……它的意思是指一種精神上的代表或前鋒，幾乎是國王的「大我」。眾神拒絕享用沒有王家祭師的國王所獻的祭品。…不僅如此，國王一生中的一切行動也都要依靠他，因為沒有他就不能成功。……其關係像婚姻一樣緊密。正如《黎俱吠陀》早已說過的：「他富足的住在其宮中，大地供應他各種禮物，人民自然服從他，他是一個婆羅門永遠走在他前面的國王」。俗世的權威之所以獲得保障，是因為國王以私人身分向化身為王家祭師的靈性權威表示順從[76]。

75 《中國的宗教：儒教與道教》，頁243-244。
76 杜蒙，〈古代印度的王權觀念〉，《階序人》，頁478。

梁武帝是否曾想爲佛教的僧侶在中國這塊土地上、爭取到類似古印度婆羅門的身分與待遇？這點我們不得而知。不過，就算他有過這樣的想法，顯然也不太可能實現。梁武帝個人的崇佛禮僧，自是毋庸置疑，在他統治時期僧侶往往自由進出宮禁無所忌憚，曾有一度朝中大臣爲了壓抑僧侶的氣焰，決議「御坐之法，唯天子所升，沙門一不霑預」，消息一傳出去，名僧智藏即刻進宮直入大殿坐上皇帝寶座，梁武帝也只好下令前議作廢[77]。然而即使受到如此尊崇的待遇，在傳統的國家祭典裡，佛教僧侶還是沒有能夠扮演任何的角色——儘管這些祭典中的犧牲，早就在佛教不殺生戒的感召下被梁武帝赦免了。實際上，就算是梁武帝對此也無能爲力，在中國歷史上(除了少數異族征服王朝外)，不管歷代君主個人宗教的傾向如何，傳統的國家祭典基本上總是在固有——也就是儒家禮儀——的規範下進行的，佛教和其他宗教是與此無緣的，這一點直到現在還是如此。傳統的國家祭典都如此，一般有關國計民生、軍國大事就更非其他宗教人士所能插手；果真有這種情況出現，在中國歷史上即會被視爲典型的「朝政紊亂」的象徵。

然而，對於在此之外的、一切屬於幽冥世界、生死之關以及似有若無之間的領域，換言之，屬於彼世——超自然或宗教性——的一些事務，儒家的士人團體就無能爲力了，而不得不拱手交給其他的宗教團體來擔綱。這也是爲何就算像朱熹那樣的大儒，在一段有關鬼神的語錄中，也不得不承認佛教僧侶確實有制服鬼神的本事，並將這種能力歸之於僧侶由於出家素食苦行而得到的卡理斯瑪(charisma)：

> 世人所謂鬼神，亦多是喫酒喫肉漢，見他(僧侶)戒行精潔，方寸無累底人，如何不生欽敬(《朱子語類》，126，頁3028)。

77 《大正新修大藏經・續高僧傳》，50：2060：5，頁466。

也因此，當我們發現他在整整一卷數十頁抨擊佛教言論的結尾，會洩氣地說出如下的一段話，或許就不至於感到太過驚奇：

> 釋氏之教，其盛如此，其勢如何拗得他轉？吾人家守得一世再世，不崇尚他者，已自難得。三世之後，亦必被他轉了。不知大聖人出，「所過者化，所存者神」時，又如何？（《朱子語類》卷126，頁3041）

聖人不出，其奈天下蒼生何？朱熹對這份神聖的使命顯然還是有些期待的，而他的理想在明太祖朱元璋的統治時期的確也曾短暫地實現過。由於對佛教在中國民間社會的影響力——尤其是佛教喪葬儀式——的不滿，明太祖開國後，在整頓綱紀的理念下，頒布了一系列大致上以《朱子家禮》爲本的禮制改革，並輔之以強制的手段，譬如說「修薦求福一切禁絕」，而火葬更被列爲大忌，重者依發塚律處斬，輕者（如果是遵照亡者遺囑）則杖一百[78]。在嚴刑重罰的威嚇下，明太祖的政策確實也曾收效一時。然而，如從日後明清社會乃至今日台灣一般民間日常生活習俗來看，不管是朱熹的理想還是朱元璋的強制手段，最終似乎還是難以抵敵佛教在中國民間社會的強大滲透力。

五、結論

西元紀年初發生在亞洲大陸上的「法輪東轉」的現象，套句佛教的辭彙，無疑是人類文明史上的「一大事因緣」。在傳抵中國數百年之後，佛教終於成功地融入當地社會，成爲中國人生活中不可或缺的一部份，而在同時——我們別忘了——佛教也還在繼續其改造中國社會的艱

---

78 詳見何淑宜，〈以禮化俗〉，《新史學》，11：3，頁52-54。

鉅工程。換言之，隨著佛教而來的印度文化與中國文化就是在這樣一個不斷互動的過程中融合起來，中國佛教的徹底素食化以及新素食觀的深入中國民間就是最好的例子。

佛教初入中國時，雖然帶來了印度傳統戒殺生的觀念，然而僧團本身並沒有將此一觀念與素食視爲一體，儘管有個別的僧侶堅持素食，民間社會與道士起而效法者亦不乏其人，新素食觀在中國民間社會的光環，還遠及不上其日後來得神聖與璀璨。梁武帝禁斷僧團酒肉的歷史意義就在這裡：首先，第一個全面素食的佛教僧團就此在中國出現[79]，而且成爲此後中國佛教最主要的特徵，僧侶終身持素乃是天經地義的事。素食的戒律貫徹得如此嚴格，以至於梁武帝改革後只不過百年，唐僧義淨(635-713)就必須要等到抵達印度留學後，才發現事實並非全然如此，還爲了素食與肉食的問題在《南海寄歸內法傳》裡發了一頓牢騷[80]。換言之，傳入中國的印度佛教，在梁武帝禁斷酒肉的詔令下出現了劇烈的變化，顯然是無庸置疑的。就此而言，我們的確可以放心使用「佛教的中國化」這樣一個概念。

其次，經過梁武帝這番劇烈的改造後，不殺生、慈悲等觀念已和素食完美的結合起來，並透過中國的佛教僧團具體地呈現出來，對中國民間社會的說服力無疑倍數地擴大了，這一點可以解釋爲何此後中國本土性的新興宗教無不高舉——不管落實到什麼程度——「素食」這面大旗。而這些宗教的推波助瀾，反過來卻又強化了新素食觀在中國人心目

79 嚴格說來，佛陀的堂兄弟提婆達多領導的教團才是第一個純粹素食的教團。不過，提婆達多被佛陀逐出教團，因此他到底還算不算是個佛教徒可能都還有爭論。此外，有關他的教團資料太少，影響也不大。玄奘等人到印度留學時，印度的大乘教團應該也是素食的。可惜的是，相關的資料仍然不足，而且印度的大乘教團也早就滅亡了。就此而言，將中國的佛教教團視為第一個——或者應該說是僅存的——徹底素食的佛教團體應當是可以接受的。有關提婆達多的事蹟，參見筆者〈潔淨、身分與素食〉一文。

80 詳見〈潔淨、身分與素食〉，《大陸雜誌》，102：1，頁28。

中的地位——對於絕大多數的中國人而言(不管他是否佛教信徒)，素食的正當性幾乎是無可辯駁的，雖然他自己多半並不是個素食者。就此而言，儘管梁武帝在西元六世紀初的改革僅是針對佛教僧團而發，影響所及的卻是中國社會觀念的激烈改造，而且我們最好也別忘了，掀起這番思想改造的核心觀念——不殺生——卻正是源自遙遠古老的印度。

Anti-Buddhism and Intellectual Conditions in Sixth and Seventh Century China

Jo-shui Chen（陳弱水）
中央研究院歷史語言研究所研究員兼副所長

In medieval China, thinkers tended to divide the world into two separate spheres. Beliefs and actions could be distributed between these two realms and treated differently. This outlook was so prevalent that it became an important intellectual premise. In this paper, I examine anti-Buddhist writings of the sixth and seventh centuries in an attempt to see how they at times reflect this dualistic worldview and at times undermine it, whether by positing that all, including the "otherworld," should come under one authority, or by insisting that the "otherworld" did not exist at all. The focus will be on the latter: how elements in anti-Buddhist rhetoric challenged dualistic worldviews, thereby undercutting the intellectual consensus of the time.

Buddhism flourished in medieval China, in many ways overpowering native Confucianism and religious Taoism, but it was also a time of strong anti-Buddhist sentiments. Much research on anti-Buddhism already exists.

Actually, it is a topic the medieval Chinese themselves began to investigate. Four rationales for this antipathy can be distilled from medieval anti-Buddhist discourses: (1) Buddhist clergymen neither paid taxes nor rendered service to the state. They consumed but did not produce. Moreover, Buddhist activities were costly, thus inflicting great damage on the economic welfare of the society. (2) Buddhism was a teaching from barbarian lands. There were no reasons for the Chinese, a civilized people, to embrace it. (3) Buddhist tenets were wild and unbelievable. The theory of retribution and reincarnation was particularly groundless. (4) Buddhism preached the doctrine of renouncing family life and secular obligations. This went against the fundamental Chinese teaching of filial piety and being loyal to one's sovereign.[1] Here I do not intend to discuss anti-Buddhist discourses in general terms. Rather, I will concentrate on one special relationship between anti-Buddhism and the medieval mind.

In the Wei-Jin period of the third century, a momentous change took place in Chinese thought. In addition to the traditional adherence to Confucian doctrine and norms, searches for "transcendental" values and truth emerged. The latter can be roughly divided into two directions—reflections on the fundamental, metaphysical nature of the world, and the creation of

---

I am grateful for my colleague Dr. John Kieschnick, who made improvements in the presentation of this paper.

1 For perceptive discussions of medieval anti-Buddhism in general, see Yoshikawa Tadao 吉川忠夫, *Rikuchō seishinshi kenkyū* 六朝精神史研究 (Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1984), chap. 14 "Chūgoku ni okeru haibutsuron no keisei" 中國における排佛論の形成; Tang Yongtong 湯用彤, *Sui Tang fojiaoshi gao* 隋唐佛教史稿 (Rpt. Taipei: Muduo chubanshe, 1988), chapter 1, section 5. The four main reasons listed here are my own summary of medieval criticisms against Buddhism, on the basis of modern studies and original materials.

other worldly lives. As a result, the Chinese mind became dualistic in nature. Orthodox, deep-rooted Confucian values constituted one dimension; transcendental or extramundane quests constituted the other. During the medieval era, people often held divergent views on the questions of what is a proper transcendental quest and what is the proper relationship between the secular and the otherworldly. However, the existence of two distinct spheres of values was generally accepted. This is a salient feature of the medieval mind.

This is not a suitable place to provide in depth discussion of the dualistic worldviews themselves, and I will give only an elementary picture. Roughly speaking, medieval Chinese had three main ways to delineate the two dimensions of the world. The first is the distinction between *ben* 本 and *mo* 末—the fundamental and the derivative, or the essential and the non-essential. The second is *nei* 内 and *wai* 外—the interior and the exterior. The meaning and usage of these four concepts are all complicated. Explained simplistically, *ben* and *mo* refer to the underlying and the phenomenal aspects of the world, while *nei* and *wai* stand for the spiritual and the behavioral facets of human life. The third type of distinction is that between the otherworldly and the secular, which was represented by various contrasts, such as *Dao* 道(the Way) and *su* 俗(the mundane), *fangnei* 方内(within the realm) and *fangwai* 方外(beyond the realm), *shijian* 世間(this world) and *chushijian* 出世間(outside this world), and *miaotang* 廟堂(governmental hall) and *yinyi* 隱逸(reclusion).[2]

2 There are no general surveys of this topic. This is understandable considering the difficulty and enormity of the task involved. For two aspects of this mindset, see Yoshikawa Tadao 吉川忠夫, "Hon to matsu" 本と末, in *Iwanami kōza・Tōyō shisō* 岩波講座・東洋思想, vol. 14, *Chūgoku shūkyō shisō* 中國宗教思想 2 (Tokyo:

Historically, there can be no doubt that the *xuanxue* philosophy of the third century played a decisive role in the formation of medieval dualistic worldviews. Yet after the fourth and fifth centuries, Buddhism became the most powerful moving force behind the development of such a frame of mind. It was particularly so in the north, where *xuanxue* declined in the fourth century, following the downfall of the Western Jin.

This paper pertains to the intellectual conditions in the sixth and seventh centuries, that is, from the period of the Liang Dynasty in the South and late Northern Wei in the north to the end of Empress Wu's rule. It was a time when Buddhism dominated China's intellectual scene, but also a time when anti-Buddhism was active. In other words, Buddhism suffered vehement attacks, even persecutions, when it enjoyed high cultural prestige. Scholars have offered various accounts and explanations as to how this situation came about.[3] My concerns here are the following: what was the relationship between anti-Buddhism and dualistic worldviews? Were there elements in anti-Buddhism that tacitly or overtly rejected such views? If there were, what

(續)

Iwanami shoten, 1990), pp. 154-64; idem., "Nai to gai"内と外, in *Iwanami kōza・Tōyō shisō*, vol. 13, *Chūgoku shūkyō shisō 1* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1990), pp. 267-78. For a new study of transcendental dimensions of early medieval literati culture, see Kuang Yanzi (Charles Kwong)鄺龑子, "Ziran: Wei-Jin wenren zai shibianzhong zhuiqiu de chaoyue" 自然：魏晉文人在世變中追求的超越, in Yi Ruofen and Liu Yuanru, eds., *Shibian yu chuanghua: Han-Tang Tang-Song zhuanhuanqi zhi wenyi xianxiang* 世變與創化：漢唐、唐宋轉換期之文藝現象 (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan Zhongguo wenzhe yanjiusuo choubeichu, 2000), pp. 59-116.

3 For principal studies of the relationship between Buddhism and native values, see Kenneth K. S. Ch'en, *The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism* (Princeton University Press, 1973); Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定, *Shina ni okeru Bukkyō to Jukyō Dōkyō* 支那に於ける佛教と儒教道教 (second edition; Tokyo: Tōyō bunko, 1966); Kubota Ryōon 久保田量遠, *Chūgoku Ju Dō Butsu kōshōshi* 中國儒道佛交涉史 (Rpt. Tokyo: Kossho kankōkai, 1986).

were they? Through this examination, we may be able to achieve some fresh understanding of the medieval intellectual world, even to detect active but hitherto overlooked notions. In the field of medieval Chinese intellectual and religious history, the transcendental aspects of medieval thought and anti-Buddhism are both important issues. Yet it seems that there have been no serious attempts to link the two phenomena together and explore the significance of the coexistence of these divergent trends. I hope my work may offer some insights into this question.

I have already listed the four central rationales used in medieval China to criticize Buddhism. None of these reasons on its own rejected or challenged dualistic worldviews. In fact, two of them Buddhism causing economic detriment and being a "barbarian" teaching – had nothing to do with Buddhist doctrine. It is also noteworthy that the strongest anti-Buddhist force throughout the Northern-Southern dynasties, Sui and much of the Tang period was religious Taoism. When Taoists attacked Buddhism, they usually did not make arguments on doctrinal grounds. Like most others, they referred to the supposed harm Buddhism did to the Chinese social and ethical order. Yet it is clear that the fundamental motive behind the Taoist assault on Buddhism came from their competition with Buddhists in the religious or otherworldly realm, although Taoists generally believed that the relationship between this world and the otherworld was a complementary one. In other words, the vehement Taoist attacks on Buddhism revealed a quest for religious authority or truth, which cannot be considered the antithesis of a dualistic worldview. The above account notwithstanding, in anti-Buddhist discourses, we can detect notions incongruent with dualistic worldviews.

The most obvious notion incompatible with dualistic worldviews is what may be referred to as "political totalism." This was a view that regarded

all human activities as under the jurisdiction of the ruler. In regard to the relationship between state and culture, political totalism considered culture simply part of governing. Expressed in traditional Chinese language, culture was no more than "transformation by the king"(*wanghua* 王化).[4] In the sixth and seventh centuries, not only intellectuals propagated this type of monolithic thought, but some rulers with non-Chinese cultural backgrounds enthusiastically embraced it as well. Xun Ji 荀濟 of the Southern Liang dynasty is a case in point.

Xun did not leave many traces in extant historical materials. His name is associated almost exclusively with two incidents. First, he once presented a memorial extremely critical of Buddhism to Emperor Wu of the Liang 梁武帝 (reigned 502-549), an ardent Buddhist devotee. His memorial infuriated Emperor Wu, and Xun fled to the north to avoid persecution. Second, when in the north, Xun followed Emperor Xiaojing 孝靜帝 of the Eastern Wei (reigned 534-550) in plotting against the military strongman and de facto ruler Gao Cheng 高澄. Xun was executed by Gao as a result.[5]

Xun's anti-Buddhist memorial is long. Among his points stands out, at least to the purpose of the present study, an argument in the nature of what I call political totalism. In this argument, Xun essentially said that Buddhism was intolerable because it usurped the prerogatives of the emperor. He listed

---

4 It seems that the earliest text which gives importance to this expression is the so-called "Preface to the Book of Poetry" (*Mao Shi xu* 毛詩序). Although this term might have been produced before the Qin unification, it did not gain wide currency until the Wei-Jin period. For references to "transformation by the king" in anti-Buddhist discourse in the sixth and seventh centuries, see Daoxuan 道宣, *Guang Hongming ji* 廣弘明集, *juan* 7 and *juan* 9, in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyo* (hereafter *Taishō*), vol. 52, pp. 130, 149.

5 See *Bei shi* 北史 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition, 1974), 5/196-7; 6/233; 83/2786; *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 3(*juan* 7), in *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 130.

ten offenses committed by Buddhism. Let me paraphrase them: First, Buddhists built halls in imitation of imperial dwellings. Second, Buddhist temples and statues with barbarian looks resembled ancestral shrines of the emperor. Third, Buddhists translated and circulated sutras as if they were imperial edicts. Fourth, their doctrine of good fortune coming from one's deeds undercut the emperor's power of reward. Fifth, their doctrine of suffering according to one's deeds undercut the emperor's power of punishment. Sixth, the Buddhist claim of Sangha being among the Three Precious Ones (*Triratna*) implied that monks were superior to the emperor. Seventh, Buddhists widely built temples and recruited clergymen as their method of founding hegemony. Eighth, Buddhists had their own almanac of activities and religious gatherings. This was to replace the calendar issued by the emperor and labor service ordered by him. Ninth, Buddhists used entertainment to attract people to their gatherings and propagated the idea of happiness in Buddhist pure lands. This was to replace moral cultivation instigated by the emperor. Tenth, in Buddhist gatherings, various plots against the imperial order were made. This was a practical danger.[6] In sum, the message Xun Ji wanted to convey is clear: the world should be one entity with the emperor as its absolute center, and the thriving of Buddhism seriously threatened such an order.

One may say that Xun Ji's version of political totalism is one with a strong Confucian flavor. Wei Yuansong's 衛元嵩, in contrast, has a different outlook. As a figure highly influential in the decision of Emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou 北周武帝 (reigned 561-578) to persecute Buddhism, Wei is much better known than Xun. He was originally a Buddhist monk from

6 *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 3, in *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 130. See also appendix 1.

Sichuan, but for unknown reasons, he became greatly dissatisfied with Buddhism and more disposed toward native numerological traditions. In 567, Wei presented a memorial to Emperor Wu calling for the curbing of Buddhist activities. At the same time, he renounced his status as a Buddhist monk. By all indications, Wei's memorial played an important role in the formation of Emperor Wu's religious policy that culminated in banning both Buddhism and religious Taoism in 574.[7]

Only a small part of Wei's memorial survives, yet it is rich in content. The most unusual aspect of Wei's religious thought is that he rejected the distinction between the secular and the otherworldly. Rather, he presented an ideal of secular utopia in which the Way and everyday life were thoroughly fused. He metaphorically referred to that utopia as the "Great Temple of Equality and Extension" (*Pingyan dasi* 平延大寺).

Wei Yuansong wrote that all kinds of people lived in the Great Temple of Equality and Extension, but particular churches and religious doctrines were nowhere to be seen. In such a "temple," Wei states:

> No distinction exists between clergy and laymen, between dear and indifferent ones. *Chenghuang* 城隍 [shrines of the city god] represent temples and stūpa; Buddha is simply the ruler of the Zhou dynasty. Regular walls and wards are built for the Sangha of this temple; people become sanctified when they are married. They

7 Cf. Yu Jiaxi 余嘉錫, "Wei Yuansong shiji kao" 衛元嵩事跡考, in Yu Jiaxi, *Yu Jiaxi wenshi lunji* 余嘉錫文史論集 (Changsha: Yuelu shushe, 1997), pp. 217-244; Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆, *Hokuchō Bukkyōshi kenkyū* 北朝佛教史研究 (*Tsukamoto Zenryū chosakushū* 塚本善隆著作集 2: Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1974), chap. 8, "Hokushū no haibutsu" 北周の廢佛, pp. 490-510.

> work hard on sericulture to pay taxes; they do so to return the favor of the state. The virtuous are selected as leaders of the temple; the elderly become high priests. The benevolent and the wise manage the temple; the courageous and the capable spread the *Dharma*. These leaders practice ten virtues (*shishan* 十善) to pacify the agitated, and show no desire to crush the sin of stealing.[8]

It should be emphasized again that Buddhist terms are all used here metaphorically. This "temple" is a secular community, not a temple. There are other details about Wei's proposal in the extant fragments of his memorial. To put it simply, his Great Temple of Equality and Extension is a utopia constructed in many ways according to Buddhist values, such as universal equality, non-killing, charity, and relief of sufferings. This is not an appropriate place to trace the origins of Wei's thought, but it seems that his fundamental idea of there being only one world in which people both led everyday life and practiced the Way or the *dharma* was rooted very much in native Chinese ideologies. In his memorial, Wei said that in an ideal human community, the Buddha was the ruler. Such a statement could well make his proposal a version of political totalism. In his comment on Wei's memorial, Daoxuan 道宣, a famous Buddhist author of the early Tang, said explicitly that the basic idea of Wei was that he refused to follow the "two schools" (*erjia* 二家, i.e., Taoism and Buddhism) and only served the Zhou emperor. Daoxuan's comment was based on his reading of the entire memorial. So Wei's memorial may have a stronger political tone than what extant

8 *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 3, in *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 132. See also Appendix 2.

fragments indicate.[9]

Signs of political totalism were not only present in Wei's memorial, but also shared by Emperor Wu. In the fifth month, 574, Emperor Wu ordered the prohibition of Buddhism, religious Taoism, and all other cults that were without official sanction. This was probably not the original intent of his religious policy; he initially meant to ban Buddhism only. However, Emperor Wu did hold a vision of a human community similar to the one proposed by Wei. It was partly due to this position that he decided to sacrifice other religious practices as well when he took the action of persecuting Buddhism. The document revealing most clearly Emperor Wu's thinking in line with political totalism is a record of his argument with the former Buddhist monk Ren Daolin 任道林 two years after the prohibition went into effect.

When Ren Daolin asked Emperor Wu to lift his ban on Buddhism, the emperor gave reasons for his action. The most philosophical defense he made was that there should not be two worlds. A world well governed by the ruler was as good as a Buddhist pure land. According to Emperor Wu, the Way was everywhere; it penetrated both the so-called sacred (*sheng* 聖) and secular (*fan* 凡) realms. Actually, there was no need to make such a distinction. As the emperor himself was a Buddha, statues of buddhas became worthless. Because kings and lords were bodhisattvas, the worship of Mañjuśri and the like should stop. The elderly could be high priests; what was the need for Pindola Bhāradvāja (known as an arhat protecting the Buddhist *Dharma*)? Benevolence was the true *dāna* (charity as a vehicle of salvation); why did

9 For the extant fragments of Wei's proposal and Daoxuan's comment, see *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 3, in *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 132. For a collated version of this text and an analysis of it, see Yu Jiaxi, "Wei Yuansong shiji kao," in Yu Jiaxi, *Yu Jiaxi wenshi lunji*, pp. 222-235.

Gautama Buddha abandon his kingdom? As frugality already stood for no-desire, *dhūta* (*toutuo* 頭陀) was meaningless. Chastity and earnestness would lead to *moksa* (deliverance, emancipation); there was no reason for accepting Buddhist commandants. Emperor Wu even claimed that civil and martial arts were no different from the Buddhist wisdom concerning "being" (*you* 有) and "emptiness" (*kong* 空). Clever expediencies in politics were just like magic transformations of bodhisattvas; promotion to higher offices was similar to attainments in meditative cultivation. Noble titles and emoluments equaled rebirths in heaven, and imperial punishments had the function of the worst hell. In sum, to Emperor Wu, all that was described and promised by Buddhism could be found in the king's world.[10] There is and should be only one world; Buddhism had no sound reason to exist.

Another incident seems also to have informed Emperor Wu's leanings toward political totalism. In the sixth month of 574, merely one month after banning Buddhism and religious Taoism, Emperor Wu ordered the establishment of the Monastery of the Unified Way (*tongdao guan* 通道觀). This was not, as its name suggests, a religious institution. It was more like an academy, with the stated aim of studying wisdom of all teachings. The rationale for such a project was that individual elements of these teachings, including newly forbidden Taoism and Buddhism, deserve inquiry as parts of a unified Way. The operation of the "monastery" also displays Emperor's Wu's preference to Taoism. The word "monastery" here adopted the character for Taoist monastery (*guan*), and most of its members were Taoist

10 "Zhou Gaozu xun Ye chuzhen fofa you qianseng Ren Daolin shangbiao qingkaifa shi" 周高祖巡鄴除殄佛法有前僧任道林上表請開法事, in *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 6 (*juan* 10), *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 155. See also Daoxuan, *Ji gujin fodao lunheng* 集古今佛道論衡, *juan* 2, in *Taishō*, vol. 52, pp. 375-6; Appendix 3.

practitioners.[11] But what was the unified Way?

Emperor Wu's edict for setting up the Monastery of the Unified Way declared that its purpose was "to promulgate and expound those subtle words of wise sages, instructions of ancient worthies, golden ceremonies and jade talismans, arcane and profound texts that could be used to nurture the common people and give support to the correct teaching." The edict also affirmed that all these valuable elements were constituents of a coherent Way.[12] A view expressed here is that the standard for judging the merits of all religious and moral heritages is their usefulness for nurturing the people and supporting the correct teaching (*jiaoyi* 教義), a code for Confucian tenets. Considering Emperor Wu's argument with Ren Daolin, it seems that the edict is saying, in a benign and indirect way, that the unified Way is very much the way of governing.

Besides Emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou, a later ruler of this time period, Emperor Taizong of the Tang 唐太宗 (reigned 627-649), also showed an affinity to political totalism. It is well known that Taizong was unsympathetic and even hostile to Buddhism, although this attitude might have softened a bit in the last years of his reign. Officially, the Tang imperial house considered Lao Zi (Li Erh), the supposed originator of the Taoist

---

11 There are a number of studies on the *Tongdao guan*. The classical ones are Tsukamoto Zenryū, "Hokushū no haibutsu," pp. 625-34; Yamazaki Hiroshi 山崎宏, *Zui Tō Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 隋唐佛教史の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967), chap. 4 "Zui no Gentōkan to sono keifu" 隋の玄都觀とその系譜, pp. 68-78; Kubo Noritada 窪德忠, "Hokuchō ni okeru Butsu Dō nikyō no kankei" 北朝における佛道二教の關係, in his *Chūgoku shūkyō ni okeru juyō henyō kōyō: Dōkyō o jiku to shite* 中國宗教における受容・變容・行容——道教を軸として——(Tokyo: yamagawa shuppansha, 1979), pp. 53-62.

12 *Zhou shu* 周書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition, 1971), 5/85; *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 6 (*juan* 10), in *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 153.

religion, its ancestor, and therefore venerated Taoism. However, Taizong had revealed a view that both Taoism and Buddhism had the potential of harming the state, and that he believed neither. He declared that he trusted only "the Way of Yao and Shun," "the teachings of Duke Zhou and Confucius." "Otherworldly teachings" (*yifang zhi jiao* 異方之教) such as Buddhism and Taoism could be tolerated but not used.[13] Unlike Wei Yuansong and Emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou, Taizong did not go to the extreme of asserting that there was only one world. Yet Buddhism and religious Taoism did not have values independently in his political thinking.

I have used four cases to illustrate that in the sixth and seventh centuries, when dualistic worldviews predominated in China's intellectual communities, a monolithic worldview with the emperor as the center was still active. As to the origins of this mentality, one is tempted to trace them to the powerful "Legalistized" Confucian ideology that was firmly established during the Han. It was an ideology that envisioned a world unified by the ruler and his preaching.[14] "Political totalism" might also be related to the Northern Dynastic tradition of considering the emperor a buddha and granting him an exalted role in Buddhism. However, I suspect that the most powerful forces

---

13 See Wu Jing 吳兢, *Zhenguan zhengyao* 貞觀政要 (Rpt. Taipei: Heluo tushu chubanshe, 1975), chapter 21 "Shen suohao" 愼所好, pp. 301-3; chapter 32 "Lun sheling" 論赦令, p. 393; *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition, 1975), 51/2166; *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition, 1975), 76/3471.

14 Cf. Yü Ying-shih 余英時, "Fanzhi lun yu Zhongguo zhengzhi chuantong" 反智論與中國政治傳統, in his *Lishi yu sixiang* 歷史與思想 (Taipei: Linking Publishing Co., 1976), particularly pp. 31-46. For the character of an earlier and different tradition concerning the ruler's relationship with transcendental values, see Yü Ying-shih, "Daotong yu zhengtong zhijian" 道統與政統之間, in his *Shixue yu chuantong* 史學與傳統 (Taipei: Shibao wenhua chuban gongsi, 1982), pp. 30-70.

behind the notion in question were the ideas, instincts, and historical experience associated with the native Chinese imperial tradition. It pertains to practical political interest as well. The following is an example. Emperor Yang of the Sui 隋煬帝 (reigned 605-618) is known as a devout Buddhist. Yet in 606, against the Buddhist tradition, he ordered Buddhist and Taoist clergymen to pay reverence to the emperor.[15] Although this order was not carried out, from this event, we can see clearly that political interest motivated a ruler to suppress the independence of his own religion.

Now I turn to another mentality in contrast to dualistic worldviews. This I shall refer to as Confucian-centrism, meaning a worldview centered in native Chinese (or Confucian) ethics. It was a kind of mentality that placed Confucian ideals of filial duties and world-ordering at the center of all values. People with such a mentality did not necessarily in principle reject the religious life or transcendental quests. But they considered values outside Confucian ethics peripheral, even insignificant. As far as I can discern from extant sources, this mindset was not as conspicuous as what I call "political totalism" in the sixth and seventh centuries. In the following, I shall give a few examples. The first is Wang Tong 王通 (580?-617), the famous Sui thinker and Confucian propagator. Wang is an unusual figure during the Sui-Tang transition in that he was thoroughly committed to the Confucian cause. He considered himself another Confucius and his mission to spread the Confucian teaching of governance. It is not surprising to find such a figure very much neglecting Buddhism and Taoism. Wang's basic attitude toward these two teachings was that they might be useful for the governing elite to

15 Zhang Zunliu 張遵騮, "Sui Tang Wudai Fojiao dashi nianbiao" 隋唐五代佛教大事年表, in Fan Wenlan 范文瀾, *Tangdai Fojiao* 唐代佛教 (Beijing: renmin chubanshe, 1979), p. 111.

bring good order and satisfaction to the people, but in contrast to Confucianism, their value was marginal. It was recorded that a disciple of Wang asked him whether it was a good idea to suppress Buddhism and religious Taoism altogether. Wang was against this idea on the ground that suppression could only bring about the opposite effect. The fact that such a question was addressed to him indicates Wang's overall mentality.[16]

Another example is opinions expressed in a great debate concerning whether Buddhist clergy should prostrate themselves before their parents and the emperor. According to the Buddhist tradition, the clergy should not pay respect to laymen; they could only receive their respect. Naturally, this practice conflicted with the Chinese tradition of treating one's parents and the emperor with paramount esteem. The first major conflict came up in the south in the mid-fourth century, when a political strongman requested that the Buddhist clergy pay homage to the emperor.[17] In 662, under Emperor Gaozong of the Tang 唐高宗 (reigned 650-683), the court assembled a large number of officials to discuss this issue. In the end, 539 of them asked that Buddhist and Taoist clergymen be allowed not to pay respect to their parents and the emperor; 354 of them requested that clergymen be required to do so.[18] The court followed the view of the majority. It is very difficult to know

16 Scholars generally hold that Wang's thought could be discerned from *Zhong shuo* 中說, presumably a collection of Wang's sayings. It is probable that this work was compiled by members of the younger generations of Wang's family, supplemented with their own ideas and fabrications about Wang Tong's life. However, this work is, in any case, a collection of Confucian-oriented ideas produced in the Sui and early Tang. For Wang's attitude toward Buddhism and Taoism, one may consult Yin Xieli 尹協理 and Wei Ming 魏明, *Wang Tong lun* 王通論 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1984), chapter 4, section 3.

17 Kenneth Ch'en, *The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism*, pp. 69-72.

18 Yancong 彥悰, *Ji shamen buying baisu dengshi* 集沙門不應拜俗等事, *juan* 6,

the religious attitudes of the officials involved in this debate because their memorials were often written in terse and conventional language. We could well imagine a person sympathetic to Buddhism arguing for Buddhist clergymen to pay respect to their parents because such a practice would not hurt Buddhism in any way. We could also easily imagine a person believing in the supremacy of Confucianism taking the position that Buddhist and Taoist clergymen should pay reverence to the parents and the emperor.

However, in the surviving documents from the 662 debate, I find at least five memorials explicitly declaring Confucian norms and values to be the fundamental principles of the entire world. For example, one expression shared by two memorials reads: "All rituals require respect, and the teaching of names (*mingjiao* 名教) is the absolute priority. Sovereign and father are the same in nature; they are honored by constant moral ways."[19] It is well known that the "teaching of names" was a common designation for Confucianism in medieval times. Viewed in isolation, the above expression may be a cliché that cannot be said to represent any philosophical stance. Yet in the context of a ritual dispute over Buddhism and religious Taoism, it is like the proclamation of a strong belief in Confucianism. Another memorial begins as follows:

> When *Yin* and *Yang* were just divided, the way of the sovereign and the subject already flourished. When heaven, earth and the human were just separately formed, the affection between father and son already existed. All people devoted themselves completely

(續)

Taishō, vol. 52, p. 472.

19 Ibid., p. 467 (the memorials of Han Chuxuan and Liu Yuanzhen).

> [to the sovereign and father], and followed the ways of love and respect. Thus we know that the relationship between the sovereign and the subject, and that between father and son, are grounded in nature. Subjects treat their sovereign with utmost respect, and father and son are extremely close. Nothing could estrange these two relationships.[20]

The memorial goes on to say that, in contrast, Taoism and Buddhism came much later. The above statements depict filial piety and loyalty to one's sovereign—the two cardinal Confucian virtues—as born at the very source of the cosmos. As values, they are incomparably solid. Surely, this is a way to affirm the centrality of Confucianism in Chinese society. In addition to the five memorials in question, another memorial, though making no direct statements about Confucianism, rejected both Buddhism and religious Taoism.[21] These documents and the fact that 354 officials requested Buddhist and Taoist clergymen to pay respect to their parents and the emperor allow us to assume that Confucian-centrism existed, if somewhat ambiguously, in the early Tang.

Then, there is the case of Yao Chong 姚崇(650-721), a widely respected courtier. In his will to his children and grandchildren, Yao criticized Buddhist and Taoist practices severely. Although he did not reject Buddhist doctrine completely and claimed that the "mind" was the proper place for the Buddhist truth to be, he was generally apathetic to religious activities.[22] We do not have

---

20 Ibid., p. 469 (memorial of Chu Shenjing and others).

21 Ibid., p. 468 (memorial of Hao Chujun, Yang Sizheng and others).

22 See Yao Chong, "Yiling jie zisun wen" 遺令誡子孫文, in *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 (Rpt. Taipei: Datong shuju, 1979), *juan* 206, and other essays in the same *juan*.

positive evidence showing that Yao was a Confucian-centrist. Yet it seems clear that he considered religious quests superfluous and even harmful. Generally speaking, it is difficult to find people in the sixth and seventh centuries rejecting religious activities and extramundane quests altogether. Even a figure like Yao made compromises. He told his family that, after his death, if they felt compelled to follow customary practices in funerary matters, he would tolerate a limited use of Buddhist rituals. Despite the lack of intellectual articulations, signs nonetheless loom that there were people, perhaps not a small number, who deemed Confucianism the chief groundwork of human existence and religious life unnecessary.

Finally, I wish to discuss briefly a view that may be called "naturalism" or "rationalism." Since pre-Qin times, among China's *shi* intellectual class, an attitude had endured that in principle rejected beliefs in the supernatural and admitted only natural and human forces in the operation of the world. The Chinese breed of "naturalism" was often associated with an outlook attaching an overwhelming importance to human factors in both collective and individual lives. It was also a form of "anthropocentrism." A classical expression of this mentality could be found in the *Xunzi*, although naturalistic attitudes also appeared in Taoist texts. Early in the twentieth century, when modern Chinese scholars began to define the basic character of Chinese thought, they often portrayed the pre-Buddhist mind as essentially "humanistic" and "rationalistic."[23] Later, China's "Marxist" scholars highlighted currents of "materialism" and "atheism" in traditional China.

---

23 Hu Shih (1891-1962) is a notable example in this regard. See his "Chinese Thought," *Asia*, vol. 42, no. 10 (October 1942), pp. 582-4, reprinted in Chih-p'ing Chou, ed., *A Collection of Hu Shih's English Writings* (Taipei: Yuanliu chubanshe, 1995), vol. 2, pp. 1035-9.

Recently, a general agreement has emerged that regards "naturalism" as a small, unrepresentative trend in an ocean of magic, occultism, and worship of supernatural beings. However, this trend did exist—kept alive by a small minority of the *shi* intelligentsia. In the era covered by this study, it seems that "naturalism" played a role in challenging the distinction between this world and the otherworld. The most conspicuous example is Fan Zhen 范縝 (active in the fifth and early sixth centuries), author of the famous anti-Buddhist treatise: "On the Extinction of Souls after Death" (*Shenmie lun* 神滅論).

In his treatise, Fan made a sharp and effective attack on the Buddhist theory of reincarnation and salvation on the ground that human souls simply dissolved after death. The modern historian Chen Yinke 陳寅恪 (1890-1969) contended that Fan came from a family with the tradition of following religious Taoism and that the motive for his assault on Buddhism lay in that belief.[24] Chen's evidence seems tenuous. On the other hand, Fan Zhen's disbelief in spirits is crystal-clear, and I find that at least two earlier members of his family had naturalistic leanings. These two were Fan Ning 范甯 (five generations earlier than Zhen) and Fan Ye 范曄 (two generations senior). Fan Ye, best known as the author of *Hou Han shu* 後漢書, even tried to write a work titled "On the Non-existence of Ghosts" (*Wugui lun* 無鬼論). The information above suggests that anti-Buddhism was, to a considerable degree, an expression of Fan Zhen's naturalistic worldview. It also suggests

24 Chen Yinke, "Tianshidao yu binhai diyu zhi guanxi" 天師道與濱海地域之關係, in his *Jinmingguan conggao chubian* 金明館叢稿初編, *Chen Yinke xiansheng wenji* 陳寅恪先生文集, vol. 1 (Rpt. Taipei: Liren shuju, 1981), pp. 23-5; "Tao Yuanming zhi sixiang yu qingtan zhi guanxi" 陶淵明之思想與清談之關係, *Jinmingguan conggao chubian*, p. 195.

that this worldview may be related to his family background.[25]

A text of the Northern Qi also carries the flavor of "naturalism." It is an essay written for the state examination by one Fan Xun 樊遜. Fan made his views clear. He held that, in the Taoist and Buddhist traditions, stories and theories of religious Taoism and Buddhism were unbelievable. Both should be curbed. Only Taoist philosophy, like that of Lao Zi and Zhuang Zi, contained tangible meaning. Fan was not an atheist in a modern sense. He still believed in the traditional theory of correspondence between Heaven and Man and certain methods to detect secrets of human fate.[26] Nevertheless, Fan Xun's case, and in inference Fan Zhen's, imports the significance of the "rationalist" elements in medieval culture. Fan Xun's work shows that, with certain people, a naturalistic penchant could lead to strong distaste for religious activities, including Buddhism and religious Taoism, while they still recognized transcendental quests based upon philosophical wisdom. In the context of sixth and seventh century China, a general opposition to religion certainly had a weakening effect on dualistic worldviews.

Now, I would like to say a few words about Fu Yi 傅奕 (555-639), the best-known anti-Buddhist in the early Tang. Fu's hostility toward Buddhism was intense and unwavering. There have been no serious discussions of the roots of his anti-Buddhism. In early Tang Buddhist writings, he was depicted as assaulting Buddhism on behalf of the Taoist religion, whereas modern scholars generally assumed that he was a regular intellectual or a

---

25 See *Jin shu* 晉書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition, 1974), 75/85 (Fan Ning); *Song shu* 宋書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition, 1974), 69/1828-9 (Fan Ye); *Liang shu* 梁書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition, 1973), 48/664 71 (Fan Zhen); *Nan shi* 南史 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition, 1975), 33/853 (Fan Ye), 57/1420-2 (Fan Zhen).

26 *Bei Qi shu* 北齊書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition, 1972), 45/611-3.

Confucian.[27] The former interpretation was apparently based on the fact that Fu was once a Taoist priest. The latter view resulted from a broad understanding of his extant writings. In his works, we find a basic idea that both Taoism and Confucianism were legitimate guiding principles of human life and they were thoroughly compatible. Fu essentially understood "Taoism" as a philosophy of "non-action" for governing, with the same function as that of Confucianism. Yet Fu's anti-Buddhism had more sources. In a memorial presented to Emperor Gaozu 唐高祖 (reigned 618-626), he writes:

> Birth and death, long lives and short lives, all come from nature. Punishment and reward, suppression and happiness, are all controlled by the sovereign.[28]
>
> 生死壽夭，由於自然；刑德威福，關之人主。

What Buddhism attempted to do, Fu claimed, was to wrest power from nature and the ruler, and this would bring about disastrous outcomes. The above-quoted statement seems to contain elements of "naturalism" and "political totalism." The question of political totalism aside, Fu's naturalistic tendency is quite clear. A specialist in numerology and astrology, he reportedly did not truly believe in these techniques. When ill, he never took

---

27 Cf. *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 2 (*juan* 6), *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 123; chapter 2, section 8 (*juan* 12), p. 168; Yamazaki Hiroshi, "Zui no Gentōkan to sono keifu," p. 72; Ge Zhaoguang 葛兆光, "Sunayama Minoru, *Zui Tō Dōkyō shisōshi kenkyū* 砂山稔《隋唐道教思想史研究》" (book review), *Tang yenjiu*, no. 2 (1996), p. 468.

28 *Jiu Tangshu*, 79/2715.

medicine or saw doctors. He took the condition of his body as fate.[29] Fu's case shows that currents of thought examined in this paper—"political totalism," "Confucian-centrism" and "naturalism"—could well be present in the mind of a single anti-Buddhist. Perhaps on more than a few occasions, they were related, not in logic, but in a specific kind of mindset. I have used the 662 debate concerning whether Buddhist clergy should pay reverence to their parents and the emperor to illustrate signs of "Confucian-centrism" in the early Tang. In fact, statements in the category of "political totalism" also turned up in that debate.[30]

In conclusion, this paper has discerned three intellectual positions in the sixth and seventh centuries that challenged or undermined the prevalent dualistic world-views. Among the three, "political totalism" was the most frequently articulated. This finding reminds us that, in premodern China, political tradition and interest often formed an independent force influencing intellectual developments. Particularly significant is the fact that monolithic visions of the king's world were alive and well at a time of a weak state. In this light, the political factor in China's intellectual and cultural history should always be carefully considered. At least on paper, "Confucian-centrism" was much hazier than "political totalism." This situation is in sharp contrast to the middle and late Tang when a trend of Confucian revival among literary men started in earnest. Compared to the two other positions,

---

29 *Jiu Tangshu*, 79/2717; *Xin Tangshu*, 107/4061. For Fu's thought, see also *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 3 (*juan* 7), in *Taishō*, vol. 52, pp. 134-5; chapter 2, section 7 (*juan* 11), p. 160; Arthur Wright, "Fu I and the Rejection of Buddhism," in his *Studies in Chinese Buddhism*, ed. by Robert Somers (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), pp. 112-23.

30 Yancong, *Ji shamen buying baisu dengshi*, *juan* 6, *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 466 (memorial of Yan Liben and others), 467 (memorial of Yang Sijian and others).

"naturalism" or "rationalism" seems the least powerful. Yet it was a constant in traditional Chinese literati culture that cannot be ignored.

Appendices:

1. Quotation from Xun Ji's memorial

僧出寒微，規免租役，無期詣道，志在貪婬。竊盜華典，凡有十等。一曰：營繕廣廈，僭擬皇居也。二曰：興建大室，莊飾胡像，僭比明堂宗祀也。三曰：廣譯妖言，勸行流布；轢帝王之詔敕也。四曰：交納泉布，賣天堂之虛果；奪大君之德賞也。五曰：豫徵收贖，免地獄六極之謬殃；奪人主之刑罰也。六曰：自稱三寶，假託四依，坐傲君王；此取威之術也。七曰：多建寺像，廣度僧尼；此定霸之基也。八曰：三長六紀，四大法集；此別行正朔、密行徵發也。九曰：設樂以誘愚小，俳優以招遠會，陳佛土安樂，斥王化危苦；此變俗移風徵租稅也。十曰：法席聚會，邪謀變通，稱意贈金，毀破遭謗；此呂尚之六韜秘策也。凡此十事，不容有一，萌兆微露，即合誅夷。

Source: Daoxuan, *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 5, in *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 130.

2. Excerpt from Wei Yuansong's memorial in Daoxuan's *Guang Hongming ji*

嵩請造平延大寺，容貯四海萬姓，不勸立曲見伽藍，偏安二乘五部。夫平延寺者，無選道俗，罔擇親疏；愛潤黎元，等無持毀。以城隍為寺塔，即周主是如來；用郭邑作僧坊，和夫妻為聖眾；勤用蠶以充户課，供政課以報國恩；推令德作三綱，遵耆老為上座；選仁智充執事，

求勇略作法師；行十善以伏未寧，示無貪以斷偷劫。

Source: Daoxuan, *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 5, in *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 132.

3. Northern Zhou Emperor Wu's argument against Ren Daolin

道無不在，凡聖該通。是則教無孔釋，虛崇如是之言；形通道俗，徒加剃剪之飾。是知帝王即是如來，宜停丈六；王公即是菩薩，省事文殊；耆年可為上座，不用賓頭；仁惠眞為檀度，豈假棄國；和平第一精僧，寧勞布薩；貞謹即成木叉，何必受戒；儉約實是少欲，無假頭陀；蔬食至好長齋，豈煩斷穀；放任妙同無我，何藉解空；忘功全遍大乘，寧希般若；文武直是二智，不觀空有；權謀徑成巧便，豈待變化；加官眞為授記，無謝證果；爵祿交獲天堂，何待上界；罰戮見感地獄，不指泥犁。以民為子，可謂大慈；四海為家，即同法界；治政以理，何異救物；安樂百姓，寧殊拔苦；剪罰殘害，理是降魔；君臨天下，眞成得道。汪汪何殊淨土，濟濟豈謝迦維。卿懷異見，妄生偏執；即事而言，何處非道。

Sources: Daoxuan, *Guang Hongming ji*, chapter 2, section 6, in *Taishō*, vol. 52, p. 155.
Daoxuan, *Ji Gujin fodao lunheng*, *juan* 2, in *Taishō*, vol. 52, pp. 375-6.

從西川和浙西事件論元和政治格局的形成

陸揚

美國普林斯頓大學東亞系助教授

唐憲宗的元和時代是安史之亂之後唐朝最爲振作的時代，雖說這一時期各方面的變化都對唐後期的影響深刻而廣泛，但就政治史的研究來說，歷來的重點都集中在唐廷和河北及淮西諸藩鎮的衝突上。對於元和前期與藩鎮的問題，特別是西川劉闢和浙西李錡這兩大事件，史學家通常只是略加敘述，就輕輕帶過而已。本文開始則恰恰是要對這兩次事件作一次比較全面的探討。一方面瞭解這兩次事件對元和時期的政治所帶來的影響，另一方面也以此來重新檢視唐代後半期朝廷和藩鎮不斷變化的複雜關係。總起來說和唐前期相比，唐後半期的社會更是一個各種社會力量聚匯紛爭的場所，因而也是一個價值觀念衝突而頗爲混亂的時代。這並不是表示這一階段的社會在政治文化上不再具有共識和凝聚力，而是說這種共識因政治和社會的不穩定而變得游移不定。所以對於唐後半期政治和社會行爲的分析必須特別注意其在世變下所具有的特殊意義。藩鎮和中央的關係就是體現游移不定的政治價值觀的典型例子。藩鎮的力量隨朝廷對地方控制力的下降而急劇上升固然是不爭的事實，

但對兩者之間關係的判斷不能從單一靜止的概念或唐前期較爲穩定的局面下中央和地方關係的模式出發，而要在特定的空間時間內加以理解。因爲藩鎮本身不斷根據他們所理解的政治行爲模式來決定其應對朝廷權威的方針，並調整和朝廷的關係。而且各個藩鎮基於自身性質和傳統的不同，其舉動的彈性空間也各有不同。在唐史研究中的一種較爲普遍的誤解就是把藩鎮對中央的不服從都視爲叛亂之舉。這無疑假設藩鎮和朝廷總是處於對對方完全瞭解的境地，採用的總是同一種政治遊戲規則。不服從的一方(即藩鎮)在採取和朝廷或皇帝說來是對抗的行動時清醒認識到自己是在和朝廷對立，尤其是和皇帝本人的權威對立。這樣研究者往往在不知不覺之中忘記了叛亂不是一個固定抽象的概念。其產生的後果之一就是當研究者面對一個政治行爲的規範在發生變化的時代，往往對種種細微發展缺乏敏感，從而對其所揭示的重大意義也就無從作精確的把握。事實上當朝廷決心建立新的政治價值觀和運作規則時，藩鎮並不一定能立刻了解這種變化的涵義和強度。而新的政治規範往往也就在這種帶有誤解的雙方政治周旋之中得以確立。這一點可以說比較清楚地體現在元和初年西川和浙西的危機上。

一

劍南西川的危機是繼節度使韋臯之死，其幕僚支度副使劉闢自爲節度而起。德宗一朝，韋臯的地位隨著其對抗吐蕃的成功和保持劍南地區的安定而節節上升。他不僅在唐代官僚集團中的地位可以說已到了無人可以望其項背的地步，而且在西川成了地方民眾崇拜的對象[1]。雖說貞元時期節度使的任期往往很長，韋臯能控制西川長達二十年也不能不說是個異數。這使他對西川地區政治社會各方面乃至地方民眾心理上都有

1 見《南部新書》(中華書局，1958)，壬部所載李石的言論，頁105。

深遠的影響，而這種影響和在他死後迅速出現的變化存在著直接而微妙的聯繫。這一點下文將進一步探討。關於韋皋去世的時間各史料的記載頗不一致。《舊唐書》及《通鑑》都將韋皋的死訊記載於永貞元年八月癸丑[2]。曾擔任過韋皋幕僚的韋乾度在駁房式謚號的議論中也稱「故太師(韋皋)永貞元年八月薨。」[3] 但權德輿所作之〈韋公先廟碑銘〉明確提到韋皋死於七月[4]。另外同樣是韋皋幕僚的符載在其《為賈常侍祭韋太尉文》中也說韋皋在永貞之際「憂國慷慨，請立太子。事苟未行，死而後已」[5]。雖沒有直接指出具體的死期，但顯然表明韋皋之死發生在李純以太子身分攝政之前，也就是永貞元年七月二十八日之前。權德輿和符載的文字都是在韋皋死後不久寫成的，可靠程度甚高。而《舊唐書》及《通鑑》的記載當依據實錄，——以八月應是朝廷接到西川送來的有關韋皋的死訊以及劉闢自稱留後的報告日期。可見當朝廷接到韋皋死訊時，西川已基本為韋的幕僚劉闢及其支持者所控制。

有關劉闢的材料並不豐富，而且現存的一些記載將他描述成一個癡狂且有神經質的人。比如憲宗時代的李肇就說他患有心疾，常有吞人的幻覺[6]。甚至連《舊唐書》「劉闢傳」中都有一段如下的描述：

> 闢檻送京師，在路飲食自若，以為不當死。及至京西臨皋驛，左右神策兵士迎之，以帛繫首及手足，曳而入，乃驚曰：「何至於是！」或紿之曰：「國法當爾，無憂也。」[7]

---

2 《新唐書》(中華書局標點本)，卷14，頁411；《資治通鑑》(中華書局標點本)，卷236，頁7620。

3 《唐會要》(上海古籍出版社，1991)，卷80，頁1745。

4 《權載之文集》(四部叢刊初編縮本)，卷12，頁72b。

5 符載文見《全唐文》(上海古籍出版社，1990)，卷691，頁3139下。

6 《國史補》(上海古典文學出版社，1957)中，頁38；《唐語林》，卷6。

7 《舊唐書》(中華書局標點本)，卷140，頁3827。

照這一描述，劉簡直是一個不明時務的愚悖之人。可是以西川的重要和韋皋的威名，爲何恰恰是這個愚悖的劉闢能在瞬息之間控制西川呢？這一個問題未受到史家重視，主要因爲自代、德以後，藩鎮擅自決定節度的更替屢見不鮮，所以很容易把劉闢的擅位看作不過是其他藩鎮的類似行爲在西川的翻版。但事實上劉闢的情形在中晚唐甚爲特殊。這種特殊性不僅體現在劉闢本人的背景上，也體現在他擅位的方式和過程之中。

在唐代中後期，藩鎮擅位的模式不是父死子承就是兄終弟及，再或就是藩鎮兵馬使等主要鎮將篡位。這些方式大多在鎮兵特別是節度使的親衛軍的支持或脅迫下完成。劉闢可以說和這些模式都不相符合。雖說劉闢在被憲宗問訊時聲稱他是因「五院子弟爲惡」而不能制，才不得已擅位[8]，但看來這只是他爲自己的開脫之詞。因爲劉在西川的變化中主導地位非常顯著。也沒有什麼跡象表明韋皋之死引起西川內部激烈內鬥。雖然個別西川的官員如嘉州刺史崔佐時及武將郝同美反對劉闢，以當時的標準看，整個交結過程相當順利[9]。有不少材料都表明劉闢對韋皋的幕僚，特別是文職幕僚相當禮遇。（這一點下文還將討論）甚至像林蘊那樣當面痛斥劉闢的人，劉都網開一面[10]。而且從他此後能迅速控制龐大的鎮兵，組織對東川的圍攻和與朝廷軍隊長達九個月的對抗看來，都至少說明他不是一個簡單的人物。和絕大多數其他藩鎮擅位者不同的是，劉恰恰又是一介文士出身，在貞元初連中進士和制舉[11]，並得到韋

---

8 同上，頁3828。

9 崔佐時為劉所殺。郝同美率部歸朝，其家屬為劉所屠。此兩事均見《冊府元龜》（中華書局影印本），卷140，頁1690上，1691下。另外還有邛州刺使崔從也反對劉闢發兵東川，事見《新唐書》，卷114，頁4196-7；《通鑑》，卷237，頁7636。

10 《資治通鑑》，卷237，頁7626。

11 據徐松《登科記考》，劉闢及第是在貞元二年。中宏詞科的年代失載，但應在貞元四年符載在西川遇劉闢之前。參見《登科記考》（中華書局本），卷12，頁441。《劍橋中國史》隋唐卷第九章的作者用「部將」（subordinate general）來指稱劉闢，殊為不當（見*Cambridge History of China*, vol. 3, part 1, p. 612, Cambridge University Press, 1979）。

皋的器重。前途應該是無可限量的。後來和劉闢係密切的著名文人符載在貞元四年寫過一篇〈劍南西川幕府諸公寫真贊〉[12]。當時大概符載和劉剛有機會認識。他在給劉的贊中就特別推崇後者的文采，稱其「氣傑文雄」。雖然符載的這篇貌真贊用意在於對韋皋府人材的褒揚，有交際中客套的成分。但他的話看來也並非信口說出。因為當時劉才入西川幕府不久，資歷甚淺。在這篇文字中，符只對另外二人特別作了文才特出的評語。這兩人就是有名文人司空曙和後來長期擔任翰林學士的錢徽。劉闢留下的文字很少，但看來都是很不錯的作品。符載還特別說劉「鑪化宇宙，無所不攻，他時圖畫，麟閣之中」。劉似乎給他留下了有大抱負的印象，所以他對劉有很高的期望。符的這種判斷當是他能在多年後成為劉闢主要支持者的導因之一。在貞元時代像劉闢這樣經歷之人一般應該都希望未來能在中央的官僚系統中成為顯要，很難想像他會不惜使自己成為皇帝眼中的叛逆。

關於劉闢對韋皋位置的繼承，沒有直接的證據說明這是出於韋本人之意見。在符載為劉闢所作的一篇祭文中，劉聲稱自己是受韋之遺命而代之[13]。我們當然可以說這是他的一面之詞。但不可否認的是劉闢和韋皋的關係的確非同一般。劉闢在其制舉上第後不久就為韋皋所辟。到韋死時，已在西川有長達十幾年的經歷[14]。而且從一個下級幕僚一直做到韋的主要副手。就韋皋在其死前不久還派劉闢到長安遊說王叔文一事來看，劉闢在韋幕府中的確占據了關鍵地位。就是因為這種密切關係，在韋死後，其聲望也因劉闢事件而受損。比如李肇批評韋好聚斂，以至造成劉闢的覬覦。這大概是當時朝野不少人的看法，後來連對韋多有維護

---

12 作文的時間根據符贊的序文，《全唐文》，卷690，頁3137上。

13 見符載，〈為劉中丞祭王員外文〉，《全唐文》，卷691，頁3140下。在符載的另一篇文字〈五福樓記〉中也有「蘢落之際，以柄授手」之語。《全唐文》，卷689，頁3127下。

14 符載之貌真贊中提到劉闢為西川幕府的倉曹參軍。該文作於貞元四年(788)，所以劉闢在此之前就已在西川。

的正史都接受這一說法[15]。有人甚至企圖以西川所造劍上有「定秦」二字來攻擊韋皋有異心[16]。後來李德裕乾脆把韋皋和李錡同列爲德宗時期擅權的節度使的兩個典型[17]。對韋的指責，即便未必公道，至少說明不少輿論是把韋皋對西川的長期控制及對劉闢的信任和西川的變化聯繫在一起的。

劉以文官幕僚的身分取得西川的節帥地位。對於其擅位的細節，正史和其他官方材料中幾乎隻字不提。所以如果我們只有這些材料，那麼即便對劉闢的動機感到異樣，也只能推測而無法論證。所幸的是長期服務於西川幕府而且成爲劉闢主要文書起草人的符載爲我們留下了好幾篇在這一事件發生期間所寫的文字。恰恰是這些從未受到唐史研究者重視的文字使我們得以對西川當時的情形和元和初年藩鎮與中央政治的複雜有一個新的認識。這裡最先要舉出的是符載〈九日陪劉中丞賈常侍宴合江亭序〉一文。該文是爲劉闢和監軍使永貞元年九月九日重陽日在位於成都東南之名勝合江亭的游賞宴席而作。當時劉闢已控制西川。雖然朝廷還未承認其地位，劉卻顯示了極高的興致。文中特別對西川的變動作了一番如下的議論：

> 曩者藩隅變故，主帥殂歿，而子繼弟及者有之，毒民殺吏者有之，逐將攘位者有之。兵戈一動，羶腥數歲。今坤維禍起，太尉公薨落。山川之所控引，兵車之所雜糅，藩蠻之所連屬，師漏於涓滴，釁成於波瀾，安危之計，懸在絲髮。我常侍沈斷元機，發如飆馳。以眄睞之力，移山丘之勢，我中丞聰明英傑，動與神遇。承要約當，談笑間萬形施張，以在靈府。遂乃推大

15 《國史補》中，頁32。

16 《新唐書》，卷158，頁4936。

17 見李德裕，〈請尊憲宗章武孝皇帝為不遷廟狀〉，載傅璇琮、周建國，《李德裕文集校箋》，卷10，頁175。

誠，布大賞，誅橫猾，拔俊異。息老稚，洗故瑕。一日而聲作，浹旬而恩被，盈月而政成[18]。

這段文字給予讀者重要的訊息。其中特別稱讚劉能迅速使情況複雜的重鎮西川得以安定，而不像其他諸多藩鎮因節帥變動而釀成災禍。所以在符載看來，劉的行動是為藩鎮樹立一個良好的典範，為歷史開了新的契機。這顯然是值得自豪的。這也是符載與劉闢有關的文字中屢屢出現的主題。上述文字中還特別提到當時擔任西川監軍使的內常侍賈某在此間的作用。稱是由於賈常侍的英明決斷和劉闢的臨危受命才使形勢十分複雜的西川得以度過危機。

即便符載的文字在為劉辯解，其對當時藩鎮在軍人主導下的節帥繼承的情形的概括卻極為精確。而劉闢和其他交接事件的不同正是符載在文中要加以凸顯的。如果結合西川的實際情形，雖然劉闢是韋的主要助手之一，但在當時西川的文人幕僚中有才能有地位者並不少。為何偏偏劉闢能順利獲此大權。如果沒有強有力的支持這是難以想像的。而且西川是一個相當穩定的大鎮，所以這種支持只有在獲得普遍認同的情況下劉的控制才能穩固。所以韋皋的因素就不能被排除在外。實際上在順宗即位之時韋皋已經病重。以其豐富的行政經驗和對劉的信任，在病重期間對劉闢有所託付是很合邏輯的。同時我們也瞭解到韋死於李純攝政之前。他既已上書公開反對王叔文。而劉也是因長安之行而得罪王叔文之人。所以在長安局勢尚不明朗的情況之下，韋希望自己的親信而不是朝廷派來的人主持西川大局也在情理之中。而監軍使對當時的情況和韋的心意必深有瞭解。其支持甚至公開選擇劉闢作為西川留後正是監軍與節帥之間的默契所至，也是劉的權力之獲得的真正基礎。而這種在節帥病

18 符載，〈九日陪劉中丞賈常侍宴合江亭序〉，載《全唐文》，卷690，頁3131中至下。關於合江亭，請參見嚴耕望，〈唐五代時期之成都〉，載《嚴耕望史學論文集》（臺北：聯經出版公司，1990），頁215。

故之後由監軍使指定繼承人又是德宗在貞元期間有意識造就的一種藩鎮的行事規範，目的也就是爲了求得安定。這在當時特定的歷史境況下具有相當的合法性。所以劉的權力繼承達到了這一要求。符載的這些議論也只有在接受這種規範的情況下才特別顯出意義。

上文已經提到，一個非常值得注意的現象是西川的文職幕僚和劉的密切關係。史料明確記載的從西川棄家逃歸朝廷的只有許季同一人[19]。像符載、房式、盧文若等人都和劉闢合作[20]。我們不能僅以貪生怕死來解釋這種對劉擅位的默許，而只有把西川的特殊情況以及貞元後期士大夫的心態和對朝廷的看法聯繫在一起才能對這種行爲有透徹的理解。符載的一篇以劉闢名義所作的祭奠同僚的文字爲我們的理解提供了很大的幫助。在這篇文字中有如下一段話：

> 昔在太師(指韋皋)，作鎮坤方，大啓幕府。聿求賢良，君赴招延，價重珪璋。賓主之際，赫然有光。余復繼來。廁接周行。契侔金石，韻擬笙簧，並几聯曹，擁閭圜廊。紛紜笑謔，爛漫壺觴。昨者象緯成災，禍丁故使。門庭倉卒，軍旅沸渭[21]。

這段話中流露出對往昔在韋皋府中的美好歲月之眷戀，這雖是以劉闢的名義說出的，卻似乎反映了當時西川幕府的一種普遍心態。韋皋在劍南二十多年，這對包括其僚佐在內的行政集團有深遠的影響。在韋長

---

19 《新唐書》，卷162，頁5001。

20 這一點當時的情形和日後這些幕僚自己的聲稱看來是有出入的。比如林恩，《補國史》明明說劉闢對段文昌「禮同上介」(見《通鑑》，卷237考異及《唐語林》引文)，而段文昌之子段成式卻聲稱他父親在韋皋晚年為劉所讒構。後甚至因被懷疑和入蜀的袁滋謀通而幾乎被害，幸靠念《金剛經》得免。事見《酉陽雜俎》續集卷七，又《太平廣記》卷106引。

21 符載，〈為劉尚書祭王員外文〉，載《全唐文》，卷691，頁3140中至下。王員外名不詳。該文所作時間亦不詳。但從稱劉闢為尚書來看，當是在劉正式收到朝廷任命之後。

期庇佑之下，這些幕僚必有一種少有的安全感，而他們之間因長期合作而產生的關係也非同一般。所以當韋皋這一支柱之突然失去，其產生的不安是不難想像的。史書上稱韋皋對「其從事累官稍崇者，則奏爲屬郡刺使，或又屬在府幕，多不令還朝，蓋不欲洩所爲於闕下故也。」[22] 其實實際情形未必如此。恰恰是在貞元中後期，德宗的朝廷採取了一種保守的用人政策。這是一個重要的問題，筆者已另文論述。簡而言之，貞元後期能在中央謀求一官半職異常艱難，對能在科舉中成功的文士來說都是如此。藩鎮對朝廷推薦人材也往往不被德宗所接受。成了一個「仕途道塞，奏請難行」的時代[23]。使很多士人不得不以遊走幕府以爲出路。在士大夫眼中，朝廷成了一個自我封閉的體系。所以韋皋一死，西川的文職幕僚便很難預料他們的前景將會如何。符載恐怕就有如此的心理。他在建中初由岷蜀赴廬山隱居，達二十多年之久，連江西觀察使李巽在貞元十六年時辟他他都不就。從他給李的回覆中可以看出他目的正是希望李能荐其入朝。但這一目的始終無法達到，所以無奈之下，他於貞元十九年向韋皋求職[24]。而韋的去世必然又會使符生計成問題。劉闢對韋之繼承或在像符載這樣的同僚看來也未始不是一個使他們的生涯有所保障的事情。

使劉能取而代之還有一個重要的外在因素，那就是和東川的衝突。劉闢出兵東川很快成爲憲宗對劉政策改變的轉折點。但劉的這一舉動的緣由是值得推敲的。當然我們如果用一般的解釋，那自然是劉闢的野心隨著朝廷的妥協而增長，以致覺得可以趁此機會併吞東川，這是所謂的「飽則逾兇」。（憲宗〈招諭劍南諸州詔〉）劉闢有野心固然不錯，但按

22 《舊唐書》，卷140，頁3826；《新唐書》，卷158，頁4936。

23 見《南部新書》壬部，頁104；又《新唐書》，卷131〈李石傳〉中李石對文宗之語（頁4515）。

24 有關符載的此等經歷，請參羅聯添，〈論唐人上書與行卷〉，載氏著《唐代文學論集》，上冊，頁53-55（台北學生書局，1988）。

照藩鎮行爲的常規而言，藩鎮僭位者通常會在逼迫朝廷作出承諾時出兵騷擾鄰近地區，而一旦達到目的則會有所收斂。雖然這種收斂常常只是作個樣子，可也算是遵循當時政治遊戲規則的一種表示。

所以劉闢的舉動頗爲突兀。他非但在成功獲取節鉞的時刻不以退爲進，以鞏固自身在西川的地位。而是大舉圍攻東川，以致令憲宗無法再加以容忍。略有判斷力之政治人物當不至於如此行事。這難道是因爲劉不僅早有吞併東川的野心，而且也預料到朝廷遲早會對其下手，所以想搶先一步奪取東川，以攻爲守嗎？

從正史裡面我們也幾乎無從判斷是否有其他原因所在，但一些當時人留下的文字卻大可以爲史家提供能作其他解釋的種種蛛絲馬跡。首先讓我們再來看韋乾度對房式謚號的駁議一文中的如下議論：

> 其時授闢西川節度，詔命初下，東川之圍未解。乃召募亡命，兼收管內鎮兵，張皇虛聲，熒惑郡縣。發兵七千，馬畜三萬，號為十五萬人。轉牒盩厔以來縣道郵次，酒肉畢具，芻蒭無匱。署牒首曰闢，副曰式，參謀曰符載。令下之日，妖氣坌興，下愚沸騰，貪冒奸賞，奔走叛命，肩摩轂擊，爭死恐後。當此之時，邛蜀震驚，田野廢業，竄伏山谷，邑居人吏，分散道路。如此之事，非得之於人，皆所聞睹。時賊圍逼梓州久，王師諸軍，稍稍繼至，猖狂凶寇，不復張矣[25]。

這段文字最關鍵處不僅是表明劉闢之大舉對東川用兵是在憲宗詔授其節鉞之後，而且是受朝廷對劉闢地位的承認而鼓舞。節鉞的獲得使劉得以「召募亡命，兼收管內鎮兵」。而且人人爲劉闢攻擊東川的舉動「爭死恐後」。如果說這些人純粹是爲劉闢個人而「爭死恐後」，而且瞭解這

25 《唐會要》，卷80，〈謚法下〉，頁1745。

樣的行動是對抗朝廷的話，那何必要等到朝廷的詔命下達以後才如此作呢？也就是說很多人願意加入對東川的行動是和朝命的感召有邏輯的聯繫。韋乾度的文字裡對當時這種人心的激動的描述是頗爲生動的。如果我們再察看另外兩種材料的敘述，情形就會較爲清楚了。

一則文字就是上文已引到的符載〈爲劉中丞祭王員外文〉。此文所作時間必是劉闢剛被授予節鉞之時。其中劉闢聲稱韋皋死後，「東川無狀，横相猜忌，破表焚牋，封山掠騎。因得討罪，誅其不義。屢犯鋒芒，幾經憂畏。天子明察，龍旌旋至。」[26] 如果照這段文字來看，那末在韋皋死後，東川的舉動也很帶有挑釁。前面的所謂「東川之圍」很可能就是指東川對西川「封山掠騎」，以圖切斷西川和外界聯繫的行爲。當然我們不能排除這篇文字中劉闢爲其行爲提供依據而誣蔑東川的可能性。但該文是爲劉闢祭新亡之友僚所作，而且當時劉闢又剛得到朝廷的旌節[27]。所以就文章寫作的心理背景看，爲劉極力辯護的可能似乎不大。而且劉顯然把憲宗對他的節鉞的授予看作是皇帝對東西川對立所表示的立場，也就是對他行爲的支持，所以符載的字裡行間大有撥雲見日之感慨。這也和韋乾度文中提到的西川人在接到旌節之後大爲振奮的情形相合。

上述的這一分析更可以從其他直接和間接的材料中得到印證。劉闢出兵東川之後，憲宗被迫於元和元年正月下詔派高崇文領神策行營入川。詔書中說：

> 劍南西川，疆界素定，藩鎮守備，各有區分。頃因元臣薨謝，鄰藩不睦，劉闢乃因虛構隙，以忿結讎，遂勞王軍，兼害百姓。朕志存含垢，務欲安人，遣使諭宣，委之旄鉞。如聞道路

26 《全唐文》，卷691，頁3140下。

27 該文標題稱劉闢為劉中丞，這顯然是劉闢在被任命為節度使之前所帶的檢校官銜。

壅塞，未息干戈，親肆攻害，擬圖呑併。為君之體，義在勝殘，命將興師，實非獲己。

這篇詔書已相當清楚的表明東西川的紛爭實繼韋皋之死而起，只是劉闢因此而擴大事端而已。而且東西川不睦恐怕在韋皋執掌西川的後期就已滋長起來，東川或懾於韋皋的權威而未發而已。在永貞時期，韋皋派劉闢赴長安求領三川，或和此種不睦之間存有某種關聯亦未可知。雖然憲宗在元和元年一月間下令神策軍入川的詔書中讓李康也配合行動，但事實上早在前一年底授於劉闢節鉞的三天之後，即任命右諫議大夫韋丹爲東川節度使，以接替現任節度使李康[28]。

可惜的是史料沒有向我們提供任何有關李康在此次事件的前後所扮演之角色的更直接的訊息。不過他的結局頗值得注意。他在劉闢圍梓州不久之後即爲劉闢的部下所執。但當高崇文的神策行營進入東川，進逼爲劉闢所圍(或所占)之梓州之時，劉闢即交出李康以「自雪」[29]。「自雪」二字自然是劉闢想要向朝廷表示自己無罪，攻打東川和拘押李康只是在迫不得已情況下的自衛之舉。李康在被退還後又立即爲高崇文所殺。關於高殺李康的理由，史料的記載並不一致。正史的記載是李因「敗軍失守」而被殺[30]。但當時還只是對蜀軍事行動的開始，即使高崇文爲了樹立威信，是否就能因此作主而在陣前殺一方藩帥，不無疑問。唐人就對高的這一行爲作出種種推測[31]。而白居易在幾年后給憲宗的一封關於俱文珍的奏章裡把此事推在當時任征蜀部隊都監的俱文珍頭上[32]。看來李康的被殺應是高和俱共同採取的行動，如此看來，這背後應

28 《舊唐書》，卷14，〈憲宗紀〉，頁414。

29 《通鑑》，卷237，頁7628。

30 見《通鑑》，卷237，〈考異〉，頁7628-9。朝廷正式對李康的懲罰是將其貶為雷州司馬。

31 見《通鑑》，卷237，〈考異〉所引《金華子雜編》、《補國史》等文字。

32 見白居易，〈論太原事狀〉其二，朱金城，《白居易集箋校》，卷58，頁3337。

得到憲宗的支持。李康之被殺，恐怕正和他在此次三川危機中也有無法推卸的責任有關。憲宗因對他的作爲早有所聞，且亦不滿，所以決定先除掉李康 。而且殺掉李康也不讓劉闢再有借口。所以唐廷殺李康正是開始著手結束劉闢對西川的控制的時刻。

還有一項不爲人注意的證據表明劉闢和朝廷的複雜關係，那就是在東川境內的戰事中，劉闢的主力，即邢泚的人馬，其實是不戰而退。也就是史書所謂的「遁歸」。而且似乎和高崇文的神策軍達成某種協議。對此這裡必須加以解釋。憲宗在元和元年正月戊子下的派神策入川的詔書上宣稱「如劉闢稟奉朝經，軸兵卻歸本鎮。朕務存誠信，必當委待如初。」而且既沒有稱劉闢爲「逆賊」，也沒有削奪其在身官爵[33]。所以劉闢的退還李康表示「自雪」，邢泚的「遁歸」都是對應詔書上的這種要求的。而且代表劉闢退還李康的也應是邢泚。據史料記載，在高崇文平定西川之後赦免了大多數西川文武將官，卻殺了邢泚和沈衍。殺沈的理由不明。而殺邢則據稱是因其「降而復叛」[34]。但卻沒有說明怎樣才是所謂的「降而復叛」。韋貫之作的高崇文神道碑提到高對邢有「僞效誠款，陰持兩端」的評語[35]。邢泚的人馬從東川退至西川並參與鹿頭關的防守有明文可稽。「降而復叛」不應在朝廷軍隊入西川，且攻下鹿頭以後發生。看來最合情理的解釋就是當邢泚的部隊和高崇文部在東川相遇後，邢泚不戰自退。而且一方面替劉闢表示「自雪」，一方面他個人也對高崇文有恭順的表示。因爲當時連劉闢在內大概都以爲只要退出東川，朝廷便不會追究。但等到朝廷在收復東川後不久突然改變立場，並討伐西川時，退回西川的邢泚等才不得不爲自己的切身利益而加入真正和朝廷對抗的行列。這才應該是「僞效誠款，陰持兩端」的涵義。

上述種種跡象顯示了劉闢完全錯誤地估計了新皇帝的用心和對他的

33 《唐大詔令集》，卷118，頁622。

34 《舊唐書》，卷150，頁4053；《新唐書》，卷170，頁5162。

35 《全唐文》，卷531，頁2388上。

行爲的看法。這一在不小程度上的誤解使劉的行動一錯再錯，處境日漸不利，逐漸成了不折不扣的叛逆。有趣的是在元和元年三月三日上巳日，當朝廷軍隊已開始收復東川時，劉闢還在成都郊外北池舉辦大型宴會。在符載爲劉闢的這次活動所作的紀念文字裡，絲毫沒有半點涉及已無法避免的和朝廷的衝突，也無憂慮的表示。劉闢彷彿還在過著十分自在的日子。爲其得到「新握龍節」的榮寵而大肆慶賀，這不能不說是耐人尋味的[36]。

二

韋皋之死和劉闢的謀求節鉞正發生在憲宗即位之初，又發生在長安的後院劍南，採取何種策略對憲宗自然是舉足輕重之事。憲宗是個性強而極有主見的君主，他從一開始就有重新建立新政治規範的意願。也就是對節度使的任命必須有絕對控制權。所以他並沒有立刻接受劉的要求而授其節鉞，而是徵劉入京爲給事中，同時派熟悉西南情形的宰相袁滋爲劍南東、西川及山南西道安撫大使[37]。這當然是希望袁在到達西川後能成爲節度，但同時又留有餘地的動作。但袁在入川後因劉闢阻兵而不得前，使憲宗不得不貶袁爲吉州刺史[38]。同時也被迫承認劉的節度地位。

史稱憲宗爲息事而妥協，這固然不是沒有道理。但正如上文所揭

36 見符載《上巳日陪劉尚書宴集北池序》，《全唐文》，卷690，頁3131上-中。

37 袁滋是貞元十年完成出使南詔的重大使命。在此項使命中，袁和韋皋曾密切合作，比如韋的幕僚判官崔佐時即隨袁滋抵達南詔。出使過程見樊綽，《蠻志》，卷4。袁本人也著有《雲南記》。參見方國瑜，〈南詔與唐朝吐蕃的和戰〉，載《方國瑜文集》(雲南教育出版社，1994)，頁660-674；又氏著《雲南史料目錄概說》(中華書局，1984)，頁151-160。

38 《舊唐書》和《通鑑》上只提及袁滋因劉闢阻兵而畏懼不前，但《新唐書》中卻提到劉闢拘押了袁的兄長袁峰(《新唐書》，卷151，頁4824)。

示，在當時的複雜背景下，是否能立即拒絕劉闢的要求並不僅僅是從朝廷實際能力來考慮的。也就是如果劉拒不服從，朝廷的勝算能有多少。憲宗也必須考慮他登基之後，是否能下決心和代、德以來的朝廷與地方的政治遊戲規則加以決裂。這後一層考慮可以說是更爲重要。劉闢的舉動即便不像符載所稱是爲藩鎮權力交接樹立榜樣，至少在表面上看是基本合乎當時的慣例的。所以採取一種強硬的立場則會對其他藩鎮的繼承問題有連鎖的效應。這在輿論上是不得不考慮的。所以如果不是因其大舉出兵東川，佔領梓州，劉闢在西川的地位很可能得到鞏固。

憲宗對三川的軍事行動實分爲兩個階段。前一階段的戰事基本在東川境內，而後一階段則在西川境內。而且隨著戰事的發展，憲宗鏟除劉闢的立場也日益明朗。但即便如此，到了劉闢攻佔東川之後，憲宗據稱還是對用兵猶豫不決。說服憲宗下決心用兵的是宰相杜黃裳和承旨學士李吉甫[39]。所以憲宗改元伊始，軍事行動就全面開始了。元和元年戊子下詔任高崇文爲左神策行營節度使，以統領左右神策的入川兵馬。四日後又下詔復置斜谷路上之館驛[40]。但上文已經提到，憲宗下令征討劉闢的詔書雖然表明用兵的態度，但在字句上卻很有所保留。這和朝廷在從劉闢手中奪回東川之後所發出的另一篇討劉闢詔的嚴厲詞句形成鮮明的對照。這種保留必定是經過斟酌的。我們不排除這有可能是再給劉一次機會，但更可能的是在當時特殊情形下，憲宗不得不穩紮穩打，走一步看一步。選擇討蜀的主帥也是頗費斟酌的一件事。這是自德宗對淮西用兵以來最大的一次軍事行動。又關係到憲宗個人威信的能否成立。當時爲相的杜黃裳同時推薦劉澭和高崇文兩個人選。據說選擇高崇文是憲宗本人的決定[41]。以地位不高但屬神策嫡系之高崇文來擔此重任是憲宗要在平藩問題上掌握主動的表示。從憲宗不願使來自河北的劉澭在勝利之

39 《通鑑》，卷237，頁7626。
40 《舊唐書》，卷14，〈憲宗紀〉，頁414。
41 《唐語林》，卷1(見周勛初，《唐語林校證》[中華書局，1987]，頁63-65)。

後得以控制重要的西川的意見也可看出憲宗臨朝不久便已甚有遠見。

僅在朝廷對高的任命下達的第二天，東川的使府梓州就爲劉闢的軍隊所占[42]。而更爲危急的情勢則是處於通往蜀中的主道之咽喉要地劍州(即劍門)亦陷於劉闢之手。劍州之陷落表明劉闢在這一時刻實際已控制了東川全境。不僅如此，據有些記載，劉的兵鋒甚至「騷黔、巫，脅荊、楚」[43]。此時朝廷尚未令高崇文的軍隊開拔，能及時遏阻劉闢兵鋒的是山南西道節度使嚴礪的力量。劉闢既已占據東川，其勢力也就直接威脅到山南西道。所以嚴礪和劉闢的衝突自難避免。元和元年正月二十二日，嚴礪部將嚴秦所率的五千軍隊在劍門擊敗劉闢的人馬並斬殺其將領文德昭[44]。這是關鍵的一役。其結果有三。第一是遏阻了劉闢的力量向川外發展。其次是使朝廷的軍隊不久得以由劍門深入蜀中。第三是這一勝利無疑使憲宗感到振奮，正式下詔令高崇文、李元奕之神策人馬入川。高崇文的五千軍力隸屬神策左軍。史料稱其行動迅速，在接到命令後幾個時辰便已出發。經斜谷關而抵達四川。同時李元奕帶領屬於神策右軍的三千士兵由駱谷路入四川。史料未明載李元奕部屯駐的地點，但從地理上看很可能是奉天[45]。高、李兩部於二月初在興元會

42 《舊唐書》，卷7，頁208。

43 《新唐書》，卷108，頁4091。此處的史料同時提到當時的荊南節度裴均派軍三千擊卻劉闢部隊。這當然是可信的，因為韓愈的《元和聖德詩》中就有「荊並洎梁，在國門户，出師三千，各選爾醜」之語。裴還因此被加檢校吏部尚書。但這應是小規模的衝突。

44 《舊唐書》，卷14，頁415；《資治通鑑》，卷237，頁7627。不同史料中所提供的克復劍州的時間不同。《舊唐書》和《通鑑》都記作元和二年二月一日。但楊於陵所上之〈賀收劍州表〉中所提供的日期是一月二十二日(《全唐文》，卷522，頁2351上)。由此文可知楊所依據的是由嚴礪直接送來的快訊，應更精確。這一日期上的出入關係頗大。因為這表明憲宗正式下詔派神策入川是在劍州克服之後而非如《舊唐書》所記的之前。同時據此文及權德輿所作嚴礪墓志，文德昭(楊表作武德昭)不僅是劉之部將，且已被劉命為劍州刺史。

45 關於神策行營的屯駐軍鎮，請參見張國剛，〈唐代的神策軍〉，收於氏著《唐代政治制度研究論集》(台北：文津出版社印行，1994)，頁113-141。

合[46]。此後合軍抵達劍州。嚴礪的部隊應已在那裡等候。

朝廷的首要目的自然是克服東川首府梓州。此時高所率之神策和嚴礪的部隊兵分兩路。高部沿嘉陵江河谷向東南先抵閬州，再向西至三百多里外的梓州地區。嚴礪的人馬則直接由劍州順蜀中的主幹道抵梓州[47]。在梓潼一帶，高崇文和劉闢大將邢泚的大批人馬相遇。正如上文已做的分析，邢部多半是不戰而退。這表明劉已決定放棄梓州。所以三月中朝廷就宣布克復梓州。同時東川境內的戰事也基本告一段落。朝廷原來派韋丹接替李康爲東川節度。韋卻因東西川戰事起而未能入川。此時韋遂建議朝廷任命高崇文爲東川節度。該建議爲憲宗所接受[48]。這一任命爲第二階段的征討揭開序幕。

對東川的收復是憲宗對劉闢事件性質作公開判定的轉捩點。皇帝顯然意識到徹底鏟除劉闢從而改變自貞元以來的積習的時機已經成熟。三月中所下的詔書就措辭嚴厲的稱劉爲「逆賊」並削奪其在身官爵[49]。這一態度上的轉變很可能是劉闢所未能估計到的。而且朝廷也不再與他討價還價。李康的被斬使劉看到了憲宗的決心[50]。劉大概此時才意識到自

---

46 《通鑑》，卷237，頁7627。《通鑑》只提及「高崇文軍至興元」，卻未說是否李部亦已抵達。《舊唐書》的記載似乎表示兩軍在一月的最後一日在梓潼會合(《舊唐書》，卷14，頁415)，但在短短幾天之內，神策決不可能如此深入。據嚴耕望的《唐代交通圖考》，兩軍應先已在斜谷與駱谷兩路的主要交會點興元聚合，由於嚴礪是對劉闢作戰最力的節度使，在其使府首先聚合於情於理應無問題。(見《圖考》，第1冊，地圖8；第4冊，頁864-5，地圖14。台北：中央研究院歷史語言研究所專刊之83，1985)。

47 參《唐代交通圖考》，第4冊，頁1166-7。

48 見韓愈，〈唐故江西觀察使韋公墓志銘〉，馬其昶，《韓昌黎文集校注》(上海：古籍出版社，1987)，頁375。又杜牧，〈唐故江西觀察使武陽公韋公遺愛碑〉，《樊川文集》(上海古籍出版社，1978)，卷7頁112。

49 〈招諭劍南諸州詔〉，見《唐大詔令集》(商務印書館，1959)，卷118，頁622。

50 史料未明言劉闢向朝廷退還李康及李康被斬的時間。但《舊唐書》憲宗紀載朝廷於元和元年五月壬申下詔貶李康為雷州司馬(《舊唐書》，卷14，頁417)。估計退還李康應在此前不久。

己處境的危險。後路既無，唯一的辦法只有軍事對抗一途。所以和東川戰況相比，四川境內的戰事要遠爲激烈。劉闢的對策是立即在成都北部險要德陽縣的鹿頭山構制強大的防衛，「築城以守」。鹿頭離成都大約一百八十多里。劉的人馬主要駐紮在鹿頭關，在其附近又「連行八柵，張犄角之勢」[51]。同時從東川撤退的西川兵馬如邢泚等部亦陸續在此集結。所以劉闢軍力在此地的總數大概達到三、四萬之眾[52]。可以說在鹿頭關附近，高崇文所率的神策軍才遇到真正的考驗。到五月初，高崇文的人馬到達離鹿頭關北大約十五里左右的羅江。這基本標誌戰爭的第二階段的正式開始。據李巽的奏章，此時高等諸部兵力已達一萬五千左右。雖然朝廷的部隊人數遠比西川少，但顯然比劉闢在鹿頭關附近的守軍善戰。所以在鹿頭關附近能連連擊敗西川的軍隊。到六月間，劉闢的部屬在鹿頭附近的制高點萬勝堆建立一新的據點，以圖扼守。奪取萬勝堆是平蜀過程中最爲激烈，也是最爲關鍵的戰役[53]。此次勝利之後，朝廷的軍隊基本掌握了戰爭的主動，得以「下瞰關城」，對劉闢的部隊造成莫大壓力。西川在失去萬勝堆之後，立即改變策略，基本採取閉關不出的態度。所以雖然高崇文和嚴礪部下嚴秦都在這一地區的一些零星戰役中繼續有所斬獲。卻未能攻下鹿頭關而取得最後勝利。高崇文和嚴礪都向朝廷提出增援的要求[54]。朝廷立即回應高和嚴的請求。但史料在這方面的具體記載較少。據《舊唐書》和《舊唐書》李吉甫傳的記載，嚴礪特別要求朝廷從河東調兵，而李吉甫則建議憲宗改由江淮調兵沿揚子

51 《舊唐書》，卷151，頁4052。又《冊府元龜》，卷359，頁4262上。

52 這一數字是依據韋貫之，〈南平郡王高崇文神道碑〉。其文提到仇良輔在鹿頭關附近率四萬之眾降於高崇文。(《全唐文》，卷531，頁2388上)《冊府元龜》則稱仇之降眾為二萬。但又提及李文悅以綿江柵三千人投降。(《冊府元龜》，卷359，頁4262上)。

53 有關萬勝堆之戰的過程，詳見《冊府元龜》，卷369，頁4388a；鄭宗經，〈德陽龜勝山道場記〉(《全唐文》，卷716，頁3262中-下)。

54 見韋貫之，〈南平郡王高崇文神道碑〉，《全唐文》，卷531，頁2387；又《舊唐書》，卷148，頁3993；《新唐書》，卷146，頁4738。

江入蜀，憲宗接受的是李的建議。但現存史料能證實這一說法的很少。只有一處材料提到宣歙池觀察使路應派兵一千五百入蜀，但那已是在討平劉闢之後[55]。反倒是河東的鎮兵不僅在阿跌光顏的率領下於此時加入戰事，而且稍後還起了關鍵作用。朝廷同時調遣的增援兵馬中還應包括荊南和神策的兵力。原來朝廷還打算調鳳翔兵力，但這一想法大概由於一些朝臣的反對而作罷。比如李巽就上奏，反對大量增兵。現徵引如下：

> 今高崇文等諸將所統已約一萬五千餘人，以整擊亂，以順討逆，授以廟算，假之天威，馘醜挫凶，深有餘力。若更多徵征鎮，廣命師旅，臣竊計之，其患有五。一則高崇文素非大將，拔自偏鎮。忠侵雖著，聲威未振。本兵既少，兼統則多。將皆權隸，士素非撫。雖是銳師，勢同烏合。局常則猶可脅致，臨敵則何以指揮。非惟崇文才分有限，此亦自古兵家所難。（中略）二則貞元以來，天下無事。四方節將，人個懷安。陛下覆燾惟新，理先清靜。今以西南小醜，久稽天誅。自春徂夏，徵發已廣，見在兵力，破賊有餘。若更務濟師，屢聞動眾。山嶮深阻，暑濕為沴，北人南役，誰不憚行。去土離家，動生愁怨。往年涇州叛卒，職此之由。事繫安危，不可不察。三則吐蕃約盟未定，窺伺在心，間諜往來，急於郵傳。又必持兩端之計，與劉闢交通。若聞發兵西南，多取邊鎮。秋風即至，虜馬已肥，冒隙乘虛，必有侵軼。事出萬一，悔何可追。四則劉闢窮寇，保險逃死。雖禍淫助順，天道甚明。而兵凶戰危，人事難必脫或黷武之師，少不如意，蜂蟻猶聚，假息旬時。攻守之間，動須應援。固當潛鋒養銳，以逸待勞。今便息兵，後將何繼。五則劍川。居人

55 見韓愈，〈唐銀青光祿大夫守左散騎常侍致仕襄陽郡王路公神道碑銘〉，《韓昌黎文集校注》，卷6，頁393。

> 食且不充；蜀路險艱，餉運無由多致。今屯兵日費何啻萬金，數州貴糴將盡。千里飛輓，所濟幾何。若更加兵，實難供贍，一夫脫有菜色，三軍無復鬥心，幸可以少成功，何必多而為患。今太原及神策諸軍已上道者其數頗多，足辦戎事。其鳳翔等鎮未發之兵，伏乞聖恩且勒權停，續後事宜以議行止[56]。

李巽當時負有財政重任，且這些建議都言之成理，應對憲宗產生影響。七月間朝廷特別申領諸路人馬都必須完全服從高崇文調遣[57]。從六到八月間，高崇文和嚴礪雖向朝廷不斷上報戰果，但實際已暫緩軍事行動，而等待增援的陸續到來[58]。增援的部隊也確實使戰事取得最後的突破。貢獻最大是阿跌光顏所率的五千河東精銳騎兵[59]。阿跌因未能按約定在八月中趕到而怕有違軍令，所以就大膽深入鹿頭山地區，且在鹿頭關之西駐紮。這樣出其不意的切斷了鹿頭守軍的糧道。鹿頭的西川守軍軍心因此而徹底瓦解。鹿頭守將仇良輔和綿江柵將李文悅等紛紛率大批人馬投降。俘虜的人馬中包括劉闢子劉方叔及婿蘇彊[60]。這使高崇文得以長驅直入，於元和元年九月二十二日佔領成都，並在羊灌田將在逃的劉闢擒獲[61]。西川

---

56 呂溫，〈代李侍郎論兵表〉，《呂衡州文集》（叢書集成初編本，商務印書館，1935），卷5，頁35-36。

57 《資治通鑑》，卷137，頁7634。

58 《舊唐書》稱高在六月間已收復漢州。但《通鑑》則只說其擊敗劉闢人馬。漢州離成都甚近。看來《通鑑》的記述更符合事實。若此時已得漢州，則成都可指日而下。

59 見元稹，〈故金紫光祿大夫檢校司徒兼太子少傅贈太保鄭國公食邑三千户嚴公行狀〉，《元稹集》（中華書局，1982），卷55，頁592-3。

60 見韋貫之，〈南平郡王高崇文神道碑〉，《全唐文》，卷531，頁2387。

61 各處史料對佔領成都的時間的記載不一致。此處筆者依照呂溫為李巽所作之〈代李侍郎賀收成都表〉，載《全唐文》，卷625，頁2796。《通鑑》（卷237，頁7636）及《舊、新唐書》（《舊書》，卷14，頁418；《新書》，卷7，頁209）皆作九月二十七日。看來九月二十七日的說法來自實錄，當是高崇文有關佔領成都的報導到達長安的日期。

得到平定。

三

整個戰爭過程實際前後共九個月[62]。和元和期間其他幾次大的平藩戰役相比，朝廷投入這次戰爭的軍力相對較少。雖然以中晚唐的標準來看也相當可觀，戰役上的花費畢竟較少。據高崇文墓志的記載，朝廷原先估計戰事要花費一百四十萬貫，實際據說只用了大約一半[63]。但賞賜將士的錢很多出自內庫，未必包括在內[64]。整個戰役能順利按計畫實行。軍事方面最重要的一點就是神策軍在整個戰事中居於主導地位。高崇文的統帥地位也得到尊重。雖然元和期間以神策作爲平藩的主力的策略實際在稍後的對成德王承宗的戰事失敗之後就基本被放棄，但這一勝利中皇帝直接控制的軍隊的重新崛起對當時人心的影響應不容忽視。

有一點值得特別指出的是，自來常把唐代中後期朝廷軍事行動的失敗歸咎於宦官監軍的制度。所以憲宗時期在軍事上的成就便常被認爲是朝廷能暫時廢除這一「陋規」所致。平定劉闢也因此被作爲例證之一。比如史書上就特別指出杜黃裳在敦促憲宗對蜀用兵的同時也提醒憲宗不立監軍[65]。杜有此議論當然完全可能，但這一番議論是否就成爲實際的

---

62 Charles Peterson認為前後才四個月，這一說法是不確的。見氏著 "The Restoration Completed: Emperor Hsien-tsung and the Provinces", 收於Arthur F. Wright和Denis Twitchett所編, *Perspectives on the Tang*(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), p. 159.

63 《全唐文》，卷531，頁2388上。

64 呂溫，〈代李侍郎賀收成都表〉中有「賜將士悉出內府」之語(《全唐文》，卷625，頁2796下)。

65 《通鑑》卷237，頁7626有杜黃裳「勿置監軍，闢必可擒」之語。但《舊唐書》杜黃裳傳則曰「又奏請不以中官為監軍，祇委高崇文為使」(卷147，頁3974)，看來杜原來的意思可能是指不以中官為神策行營的統帥。這和不立監軍是大有區別的。

方針則是另一碼事。實際上認爲此次用兵的成功和不立監軍有關是錯誤的。前人就已指出俱文珍不僅是征討劉闢之都監，而且在平蜀之後，也和高崇文一起被委以善後的重任。而另一則不爲以往史家所注意的材料則更能說明問題。鄭宗經在其《德陽龜勝山道場記》中，就明確提到在關鍵的萬勝堆一役之後，「(崇文)與都監使劉公、監軍使徐公觀變御敵，分營守要。自是凶徒居則魄悸魂落，出則輿屍折首。面縛倒戈，請命轅門。」[66] 劉公應即是後來改名劉貞亮的俱文珍。徐公的名字不見史載，但稱其監軍使，則不是具體監督高崇文所屬神策行營的監軍，就是東川的監軍。可見在戰事最激烈的階段，主要的監軍都在現場參與指揮。當然值得注意的是在劍南一役中，沒有出現監軍橫加干預的跡象。高崇文對戰事的主導地位自始至終沒有動搖。而監軍與主帥之間的合作看來亦相當成功。這成爲憲宗一朝在處理藩鎮問題上的特點。討蜀的成功也使一批朝廷將領由此露出頭角，在以後元和期間的戰事中扮演重要角色。這些將領包括高霞寓、阿跌光顏(即後來的李光顏)、酈定進。甚至連降將仇良輔、李文悅都是後來平定淮西蔡州一役的重要參加者[67]。

劉闢事件得到解決之後，朝廷對東西川的策略基本是以安撫爲主。這一點在平定西川之後的種種小心的舉措中即可看出。高崇文的部隊據說在入成都時「軍令整肅」[68]，而且「軍府事無巨細，命一遵韋南康故事。」[69] 朝廷除了決定將西川轄下的資、簡、陵、榮、昌、瀘六州劃歸東川之外，對西川並無其他懲罰性措施。相反還宣布量減東西川和山南

66 《全唐文》，卷716，頁3362c。

67 仇良輔是李愬部將，在襲蔡州一役中擔任守文城的任務，見段文昌，〈平淮西碑〉，《全唐文》，卷618，頁2763上；李文悅則是節度行營的幕僚，見〈華嶽題名〉，載《韓昌黎文集校注》，頁734。

68 《舊唐書》，卷151，頁4052。

69 《通鑑》，卷237，頁7636。

西道的租稅[70]。上文已經提到，劉在西川得到諸多文人幕僚的支持。唐廷對於這一情況及其背景非常清楚。所以對絕大部份在幕府的「衣冠」人士非但網開一面，而且都報請朝廷優先擢用，所以「房式等未至京師，皆除省寺官」[71]這些人包括房式、韋乾度、獨孤密、郗士美等。這一措施並不只是一種一般的寬大表示，而是特別針對這些士人對朝廷的失望和因朝廷藩鎮的種種變故而感到的不安而來的。否則就難以解釋爲什麼他們中間有些甚至是和劉關關係密切的人也仕途順利。例外是少數。比如因爲和劉的關係太過密切，符載的仕途就大受影響。直到元和五年才受到趙宗儒的招辟[72]。但朝廷畢竟沒有再加罪於他。

平定西川後嚴礪由山南西道調任爲東川節度使，而高崇文則被授予西川節度。在兩人任內，朝廷對劍南地區的安撫政策並沒有都得到貫徹。嚴礪及其屬下對東川的掠奪在元和四年巡察東川的元稹的奏章中有詳盡的報導，以往學者也有詳盡的論述，這裡就不再重複[73]。而高崇文因無行政的能力，在任西川節度一年之後，要求調往京西北藩鎮。雖然他在入成都時能做到「軍令整肅」，臨行前卻終於忍不住而將成都府庫洗劫一空[74]。好在嚴礪和高崇文都只是過渡性的人物。武元衡接替高崇文成爲西川節度，才使元和期間朝廷對劍南地區危機的處理過程真正告

70 見〈平劉闢詔〉，載《唐大詔令集》，卷124，頁665。其中簡、資二州在元和四年又因武元衡之請而歸回西川(《新唐書》，卷67，頁1879)。

71 同上，頁7637。《唐語林》在給其所載的《補國史》的一段文字作的附注中稱符載也被除秘書郎，這一說法無法得到印證。見《唐語林》，卷1，頁65。

72 見柳宗元，〈賀趙江陵宗儒辟符載啓〉，見《柳河東集》(中華書局，1958)，卷35，頁559。

73 有關此過程的研究見Charles Peterson, "Corruption unmasked: Yuan Chen's Investigation in Szechwan," *Asia Major* 18(1972)：34-78；又卞孝萱，《元稹年譜》，頁110-3。

74 《舊唐書》，卷150，頁4053；《新唐書》，卷170，頁5162。高崇文對西川財富的掠奪恐怕不止是他個人的慾望，史料記載，他在邠寧節度時曾送杜黃裳錢四萬五千緡(《舊唐書》，卷147，頁3974-5；《新唐書》，卷169，頁5147)，這顯然是為了報答杜黃裳的推舉之恩。

一段落。史稱武元衡在蜀期間的行政目的是盡量避免擾民，以使大亂之後的蜀中能得到休養生息。所以元和八年憲宗在召其回京爲相的制書中稱他在蜀期間能使「縣道輯寧，疲黎安息」，結果是「理有異等」[75]。其他史料也稱他「庶事節約，務以便人。比三年，公私稍濟」[76]。這些都應該說是離事實不遠的。同時他的幕府更是人材濟濟。治蜀的這一勞績與數年後被重新召回長安主持大局有直接的關係。看來他自己對長達六年的治蜀過程也感到滿意。在元和八年由西川返長安執政途中，武元衡所賦的詩中將自己比作平定西域的班超[77]。

自武元衡開始，唐廷對西南的控制進一步強化。西川依然是唐疆域內最爲富庶的地區之一。而且自元和四年嚴礪之死起，劍南東西川長期由中央高級文官出掌。其文治的結構完全確立。但其軍事力量則相應薄弱。原本韋皋爲對抗吐蕃和南詔而建立起來的防禦力量也因劉闢的被討平而遭到削弱。這一薄弱的局面使多年後在杜元穎任西川節度期間，南詔可以輕易的兵臨成都城下。雖然該次事變，杜元穎本人的失職要負責任。但正如李德裕在爲杜辯護的奏章中提到，西川自武元衡時代起防務逐漸鬆懈[78]。而這也正是當年以平定內亂爲要務的憲宗朝野所未能充分估計到的。

緊接劉闢事件而起的是發生在元和二年的浙西的李錡和朝廷的對立。這一事件也是憲宗雷厲風行推行其新政治規範的一個結果。雖然李錡遠不如韋皋的地位，威信和貢獻，其對地方的控制卻和韋有相似之

75 見〈武元衡平章事制〉，《唐大詔令集》，卷46，頁231。

76 《舊唐書》，卷158，頁4160；《冊府元龜》，卷677，頁8094上；卷680，頁8126上。

77 武元衡，〈元和癸巳余領蜀七年奉詔征還二月二十八日清明途經百牢關因題石門洞〉，《全唐詩》（中華書局，2000），卷316，頁3552。

78 李德裕，〈故循州司馬杜元穎〉第二狀，見傅璇琮、周建國，《李德裕文集校箋》，卷12，頁208。玩味李氏文意，也並未完全指責武氏，而是認為韋皋為向南詔示好而故意亭障不修，以致此後不便改變此策，以免南詔生疑。

處。前者也是貞元以來長期控制地方的藩帥之一。李錡是淮安王李神通之後，爲朝廷殉職的李國貞之子。自貞元起長期擔任浙西的地方長官，先後作過杭、湖、常三州的刺史[79]。最後在貞元十五年做到浙西節度，並如同前任節度王緯、李若初那樣同時擔任諸道鹽鐵轉運使[80]。其應運而起也和德宗在貞元後期的政治策略有直接的關係。在貞元後期，德宗爲了盡力確保皇帝本人對一些關鍵的方面的控制而在中央採取緊縮內斂的用人方針，依賴少數他所信賴的內外廷官員來主持行政以提高效率。在地方則利用強悍但是效忠於朝廷的節度使來加強地方的穩定。並特別把財政上對朝廷的直接貢獻作爲衡量從中央到地方的官員成績的重要標準。於此同時，德宗對濫權的現象採取姑息。因爲在這些方針下，這是很難避免的。地方上最爲突出的例子就是山南東道的于頔和浙西的李錡[81]。李錡的政績當然遠比不上韋皋，也不如于頔。他之所以能成爲浙西節度，據說就是因爲厚賂德宗寵臣李齊運的結果[82]。史料指責李錡利用浙西的富庶和鹽利的豐厚大事聚斂，大設津堰以侵剝來往商人[83]。這些指控大概都有根據，但在貞元時代聚斂濫權卻是頗爲平常的事。更何況作爲朝廷物資資源主要來源的浙西的節度使，要不聚斂也難以做到。實際上以德宗的精明對這些情況也未嘗不知，只是李「專事貢獻，牢其寵渥」，所以也就得到德宗的信任。但因此也使李錡日益驕縱。以浙西觀察使、鹽鐵使的身分和浙西人物物產和良好環境，李錡原本可以通過吸引士大夫作爲幕僚等方法建立良好的聲望，但他卻反其道而行之。後來

---

79 見郁賢皓，《唐刺史考全編》（安徽大學出版社，2000），第3冊，頁1888，1950，1980。

80 李被除為浙西觀察使及諸道鹽鐵轉運使的時間為貞元十五年二月乙酉。見《舊唐書》，卷13，頁388。

81 有關于頔的研究，見Denis Twitchett, "Seamy Side of Late Tang Political Life：Yü Ti and His Family," *Asia Major*, vol.1,part 2(1991): 29-63.

82 《舊唐書》，卷135，頁3730；《新唐書》，卷167，頁5111。

83 《唐會要》，卷87，〈轉運鹽鐵總敘〉，頁1886，1887；《舊唐書》，卷49，〈食貨志〉，頁2119。

成爲元和時期重要人物的裴度、盧坦等人都曾是李錡的幕僚，但據說也都因李錡的橫暴而離開[84]。尤其是生瘞崔善貞事件更使天下側目[85]。所以當一批很有目光抱負的士大夫在憲宗即位後起來主持政局，他們便自然不會對李錡有好感。

江淮雖說是唐朝的經濟命脈所在，但在九世紀初，除了淮南，鄂岳，和浙西，其他江淮藩鎮都基本不擁有重兵。而在李錡任職期間，浙西在軍力上則是頗爲充足的。其中原因是多方面的。在建中、貞元間，爲了防衛江淮地區，當時任浙江東西節度的韓滉勤練兵馬，使浙西的軍隊成爲善戰的組織。這一成果爲李錡所繼承[86]。還有一部分是原鎮守渦口三城的徐州鎮兵，在張建封死後的徐州兵亂時在張子良率領下轉投浙西，子良也因此成爲李錡手下最重要的將領之一[87]。而另一方面李錡本人也因財富的聚積而培植親衛軍：

> 選善射者為一屯，號「挽硬隨身」；以胡、雜類鬚者為一將，號「蕃落健兒」，皆錡腹心，稟給十倍，使號錡為假父，故樂

---

84 見李翱，〈故東川節度使盧公傳〉，《李文公集》，卷12；《通鑑》，卷236，頁7597。

85 《舊唐書》，卷112，頁3341；《新唐書》，卷224，頁6382；《通鑑》，卷7596-7。

86 元稹，〈唐故開府儀同三司檢校兵部尚書兼左驍衛上將軍充大內皇城留守御史大夫上柱國南陽郡王贈某官碑文銘〉有「潤之師故南陽韓晉公之所教訓，號為難當」之語，見《元稹集》(中華書局，2000)，卷52，頁566-570。王應麟《玉海》卷138特別提到有關韓滉練「子弟軍」之事(元本，臺北：華文書局影印，1957，頁2667反面)。但正如方積六所指出的，這些「子弟軍」在韓滉之後就不再被提及(見氏著《關於團結兵的探討》，載《文史》，第25輯，頁103)，當然未被提及不等於不存在。而且根據團結兵的性質，很可能是在各州刺史的控制之下。筆者懷疑此後湖、常等州能和李錡鎮兵對抗，很可能就是得益於這些鄉兵。

87 見元稹，〈唐故開府儀同三司檢校兵部尚書兼左驍衛上將軍充大內皇城留守御史大夫上柱國南陽郡王贈某官碑文銘〉，《元稹集》，卷52，頁567。據元稹的文字，張子良所率之投向浙西的兵力有二萬之眾。

為其用[88]。

到元和二年的秋天，在江淮地區的方鎮長官中李錡一人的任期最長，已達八年之久。一方面憲宗的新政治規則到此時已全面登場，另一方面從順宗時代起唐廷就開始加強的對江淮財政的直接控制也愈加緊密。王叔文集團以杜佑來取代李錡爲鹽鐵使，而王叔文本人以副使身分來直接控制鹽利是其中第一步。從此鹽鐵使的治所也由潤州轉回長安。王叔文這樣做或還有其他目的所在，起初未必都直接針對李錡，但無疑是限制李錡權力的開始[89]。但在順宗時代，長安的政局一時間也大概不能使新措施立刻影響到李錡，而且朝廷當時爲了安撫後者，還將其升爲鎮海節度使[90]。但到了憲宗即位後，來自朝廷的壓力便驟然增加。首先是永貞元年八月憲宗派鹽鐵副使潘孟陽宣慰江淮，「行視租賦、榷稅利害，因察官僚否，百姓疾苦」[91]。這是憲宗即位後最先做的事情之一。潘孟陽的首要使命就是調查順宗時將鹽鐵使權收歸中朝後在江淮的工作交接情形[92]。李錡權力之所及都應是潘孟陽此行巡視的對象。雖然潘孟陽很不稱職，一路遊山玩水。所以此行歸來之後便立即被罷爲大理卿[93]。但朝廷控制江淮財政的方針已開始落實爲具體步驟，這對李錡無疑是個警訊。而輿論方面也對李錡日趨不利。當永貞末刑部郎中杜兼被任

88 引文見《新唐書》，卷224，頁6382；又《舊唐書》，卷112，頁3341。

89 吳麗娛在其〈論唐代財政三司的形成發理及其與中央集權制的關係〉一文中認為順宗朝的這一變化為憲宗朝所延續，成為唐代中後期財政改革之重要環境，此說甚有見地(該文載《中華文史論叢》1986年第1輯)。又陳衍德、楊權，《唐代鹽政》(三秦出版社，1990)，頁72-3。

90 韓愈，《順宗實錄》，卷1，《韓昌黎文集校注》，頁702-3(馬其昶校注，馬茂元整理，上海：古籍出版社，1987)；《通鑑》，卷236正文並考異，頁7612。

91 《通鑑》，卷236，頁7621。

92 命潘巡視江淮的詔書見《大唐詔令集》，卷116，頁609。

93 《舊唐書》，卷112，頁4239；《新唐書》，卷160，頁4972。

爲蘇州刺史時，杜居然上書聲稱「李錡且反，必且奏族臣」，所以不願赴任[94]。據有關杜兼的資料來看，杜作風亦頗強悍恣肆[95]，所以他不願赴任的原因恐怕是因爲擔心若一旦成爲李錡屬下的州刺史。會不可避免與李起衝突。但他能公開以李錡必反爲由則至少說明他認爲這是有說服力的。而憲宗也居然接受其請求，將其轉任爲吏部郎中[96]。這樣的舉動頗不尋常。李錡也不可能不有所聞[97]。

雖然形勢對他已漸爲不利，李錡最初的打算還是如何能通過他所熟悉的政治遊戲規則來謀取新君主下的出路。他首先是「厚賂貴幸，請用韓滉故事領鹽鐵，又求宣歙。」但他的這些動作在新環境下已難以產生作用。承旨學士李吉甫便勸阻憲宗不要讓李錡重領鹽鐵[98]。吉甫長期在江南爲官，對「方鎮彊恣」一向痛疾。憲宗無疑接受了這樣的建議。元和元年四月李巽成爲鹽鐵轉運使使李錡重領鹽鐵的希望徹底破滅[99]。原屬浙西的諸多堰埭也自此被李巽全部收歸或廢除[100]。這不但切斷了李錡的諸多財路，也是向其權威直接的挑戰。元和二年六月乙亥，朝廷更宣布停潤州丹陽軍額。這是元和期間削減江南地方軍政開支的措施之

94 引文見韓愈，〈故中散大夫河南尹杜君墓誌銘〉，載《韓昌黎文集校注》，卷6，頁390-1。

95 見柳宗元〈杜兼對〉中對杜的評價(《柳河東集》，卷14，頁226-7。又《舊唐書》、《新唐書》，卷172，〈杜兼傳〉。

96 韓愈，〈故中散大夫河南尹杜君墓誌銘〉，載《韓昌黎文集校注》，卷6，頁390-1。《通鑑》，卷2336，頁7624。

97 對此事的議論，見元稹的上奏〈論追制表〉，見《元稹集》，卷33，頁376-7。元稹此表作於元和元年，見卞孝萱，《元稹年譜》(齊魯書社，1980)，頁98。

98 引文見《新唐書》，卷146，頁4738。韓滉於建中年間以鎮海軍節度使領鹽鐵。而李錡也在順宗時期被昇為鎮海節度使，所以他顯然想循此舊例。

99《舊唐書》，卷14，頁417：《通鑑》，卷237，頁7630：《唐會要》，卷87，〈轉運使〉條，頁1897。

100 見《唐會要》，卷87，頁1887：《舊唐書》，卷49，〈食貨志〉，頁2119。史料沒有明說李巽的這些行動是否在李錡尚為浙西節度時就已開始，但對堰埭的控制是鹽鐵使工作成功與否的關鍵之一。以李巽作風的雷厲風行和整頓鹽務的工效之迅速，很難想像他會等到李錡下台後才開始這項工作。

一。

劉闢被討平後，李錡自知不能對朝廷無所表示。所以他上表一再要求入朝覲見[101]。他這樣做雖不得已，但也因此試探朝廷的反應。由於入朝的表示是他主動做出的，李錡當然希望能因此得到憲宗的嘉勉，會或讓其繼續保有在浙西的地位，或將他調至另一個富庶的江南藩鎮擔任長官。至少看來他估計這一作法對自己有利。《新唐書》中提到的李錡不斷游說長安的權勢人物以圖取得宣歙觀察使的記載很符合當時的境況[102]。他所未能料到的是他入朝的表面文章卻正給予憲宗難得的機會。憲宗雖然沒有立刻下詔召李錡入朝，卻已明確表示願意接受這一請求，而且表示要任命李錡爲尚書左僕射[103]。如果李錡此時能入朝，他應有機會和其他入朝的資深藩鎮節度一樣得到憲宗的優容。但李顯然不願走這一步。他的利益長期得之於江南，自然難以割捨。而且他大概也沒有

---

101 現存史料沒有明言李錡最早在何時上書表示要入覲。但《新、舊唐書》和《通鑑》都提到因藩鎮崛強者在討平劉闢後多求入朝，李錡不自安，故也請入朝。查核史料，元和元年十一月武寧軍節度使張愔入朝。李錡的請求或在此後不久。

102 《新唐書》，卷146，頁4738。

103 據《舊唐書》，卷14，〈憲宗紀〉提到元和二年十月己酉以李錡為左僕射，並以李元素為浙西節度(頁422)，而《通鑑》則作十月己未(卷237，頁7640)查平岡武夫，《唐代の曆》(京都大學人文科學研究所，1954，頁235)，元和二年十月只有己未而無己酉。據此則《通鑑》似乎正確。但值得注意的是二年九月卻有己酉，為該月二十五日。從時間上說九月己酉和十月己未都有可能。據《通鑑》上下文順序，朝廷的此項任命似乎發生在李錡殺王澹、脅中使之後。這在情理上很難說得通。《舊唐書》「李錡傳」中則較為明確的說是朝廷「乃拜錡左僕射。錡乃署判官王澹為留後」(卷112，頁3341)。又〈討李錡詔〉中有「乃降詔書，俾修覲禮，示以後命，委其深心」之語，而詔書下文又提到李錡殺王澹、脅使臣之事(《唐大詔令集》，卷119，頁629)。「示以後命」之語當就是指告知李入朝後的新職而言。根據此上下文，則任命當在兵變之前，而且發生在接受李錡入覲請求的同時，這之後才不斷催促李錡守諾。這不僅與《舊唐書・李錡傳》相合，也合乎情理。所以應是憲宗先讓中使把旨意授予李錡。而正式下詔任命則是在九月己酉或十月己未。應為一旦正式下詔，則朝廷威命所寄，不能收回。此後一問題不易解決，只能先作推測於此。

料到憲宗的決定是非但接受他入朝的請求，而且是要將他留在朝中。左僕射的位置在九世紀雖然有非常隆崇的地位，但終究是個閑職[104]。而且李畢竟和于頔、裴均一類人物的地位、資歷和名望無法相比，所以他不能不擔心這樣一來，會永遠失去再回江淮的機會。所以李錡不斷拖延入京的時間。但憲宗也不斷派中使赴京口(即潤州)敦促李錡守諾[105]。李只能指定其幕僚王澹留後主持幕府大局，自己作出準備入京的姿態。

但出乎李錡意料的是王澹居然加入了中使的行列來勸李錡入朝，而且「於軍府頗有制置」[106]。專權的節度往往對有能力的幕僚懷有戒心，更何況王澹已處於主持留務的地位。王改動李錡定下的規章是來自內部對李的挑戰。若王的地位穩固，則李錡將徹底失去其權力基礎。李錡惱怒之下只能以疾病為借口不斷拖延入朝的時間。李錡的一再拖延終於使朝廷失去耐心。當李錡上奏稱病說要到元和二年年底才能成行時。憲宗向宰相徵詢意見，雖然宰臣中鄭絪表示可以接受李的請求，李吉甫和武元衡都堅決反對。元衡指出：「錡自請入朝，詔既許之，即又稱疾，是可否在錡。今陛下新臨大寶，天下屬耳目，若能使奸臣得遂其私，則威令從茲去矣」[107]。武的意見正體現了憲宗新政治規範的核心，也就是皇帝對藩鎮的絕對權威。所以到了元和二年的九月二十五日，憲宗正式宣布徵李錡為左僕射，並調御史大夫李元素為浙西節度。憲宗派遣的中使抵達京口，一面犒勞將士，一面敦促李錡入京。這是向李發出最後通牒。在此內外壓力之下，李決定策動兵變，以造成逼迫他留下的假象。《新唐書》對這一兵變過程有頗為生動的記述：

---

104 有關尚書僕射在唐中期以後地位的變化參見嚴耕望，〈論唐代尚書省之職權和地位〉，載《嚴耕望史學論文選集》(台北：聯經出版事業公司，1991)，頁437-441。

105 〈討李錡詔〉有「累降中人，令遵前旨」之語(《唐大詔令集》，卷119，頁629)。

106 《通鑑》，卷237，頁7640。

107 《舊唐書》，卷158，頁4160。

因給冬服，錡坐幄中，以挽硬、蕃落自衛，澹與中使入謁，既出，眾持刀謾罵，殺澹食之。監軍使遣牙將趙琦慰諭，又食之。以兵注中使頸，錡陽驚扈解，乃囚別館。蕃落兵，薛頡主之；挽硬兵，李鈞主之。又以公孫玠、韓運分總餘軍。室五劍，授管內鎮將，令殺五州刺史。屬別將庾伯良兵三千石頭城，謀據江左[108]。

值得注意的是負責兵變的主要成員似乎正是李錡本人的親衛軍「挽硬」和「蕃落」。李雖然指使部下殺王澹和趙琦，卻故意作出保護中使的姿態。李試圖以這分寸上的拿捏來表示對抗朝命的決非他本人。在其總部策動兵變的同時，李錡也想迅速控制屬下的各州。但他的這個企圖幾乎完全失敗。《通鑑》有如下的記載：

(元和二年十月)庚申，錡表言軍變，殺留後、大將。先是錡選腹心五人為所部五州鎮將，姚志安處蘇州，李深處常州，趙惟忠處湖州，丘自昌處杭州，高肅處睦州，各有兵數千，伺察刺史動靜。至是，錡各使殺其刺史，遣牙將庾伯良將兵三千治石頭。常州刺史顏防用客李雲計，矯制稱招討副使，斬李深，傳檄蘇、杭、湖、睦，請同進討。湖州刺史辛秘遣募鄉閭子弟數百，夜襲趙惟忠營，斬之。蘇州刺史李素為姚志安所敗，生致於錡，具桎梏釘於船舷，未及京口，會錡敗，得免[109]。

108 《新唐書》，卷224，頁6382-3。又類似記載見《通鑑》，卷237，頁7640-1；《舊唐書》，卷112，頁3341。

109 《通鑑》，卷237，頁7640-1。有關顏防的記載可在謝楚〈為同州顏中丞謝上表〉中得到證實(《全唐文》，卷721，頁3289上)。其中提到的李雲，看來亦有其事。沈亞之，〈李紳傳〉提及劉騰曾撰文褒揚其事(《全唐文》，卷737，頁3378下)。

有關辛秘還有如下的記載：

> 元和初，拜湖州刺史。未幾屬李錡阻命，將收支郡，遂令大將監守五郡。蘇常杭睦四州刺史，或以戰敗，或被拘執；賊黨以秘儒者，甚易之。秘密遣衙門將丘知二勒兵數百人，候賊將動，逆戰大破之。知二中流矢墜馬，起而復戰，斬其將，焚其營，一州遂安[110]。

各州對李錡採取堅決對抗。雖然蘇杭二州刺史抵抗失敗，湖州的辛秘和常州的顏防卻獲得成功，而且鄰近的宣歙觀察使路應，在得到浙西各州和李錡對抗的消息後，也發兵救援湖、常等州[111]。在湖、常的失敗不僅出乎李錡的意料，也直接影響到其牙軍的士氣。

大概在李錡聲稱兵變的表章到達長安之前，淮南節度王鍔也已把真相報知憲宗[112]。所以朝廷於十月八日(壬戌)正式下詔削去李錡的官職和屬藉，並任命淮南節度王鍔爲諸道行營兵馬招討處置使，以宦官薛尚衍爲都監。發淮南、宣武、武寧、武昌、宣歙、江西和浙東等鎮兵馬進討[113]。這

---

110 引文見《舊唐書》，卷157，頁4150-1。類似文字也見於《冊府元龜》，卷694，頁8283下。

111 《新唐書》，卷138，頁4624。

112 元稹〈唐故開府儀同三司檢校兵部尚書兼左驍衛上將軍充大內皇城留守御史大夫上柱國南陽郡王贈某官碑文銘〉有「揚帥鍔以叛告」之語，《元稹集》，頁568。

113 〈討李錡詔〉，《唐大詔令集》，卷119，頁629。下詔日期《舊唐書》，卷14，〈憲宗紀〉作壬戌(頁422)，而《新唐書》，卷7，〈憲宗紀〉(頁209)和《通鑑》，卷237均作乙丑。據元稹的〈唐故開府儀同三司檢校兵部尚書兼左驍衛上將軍充大內皇城留守御史大夫上柱國南陽郡王贈某官碑文銘〉，李錡於十月十一日命張子良等率部攻宣歙，十二日子良等倒戈。而李錡命下之時子良等已知朝廷討伐詔令。同時元文說朝廷下詔討伐後「不浹日」，便受到子良等擒李錡的露布(頁568)。《舊、新唐書》、《通鑑》均載朝廷於十月癸酉日收到浙西軍的上奏。以此則似乎乙丑更為貼切。筆者以為上述兩個日期都對。區別在於壬戌為詔下之日，乙酉則為有關討伐軍組成的具體命令的發布。但此時朝廷應早已通知浙西的諸鄰鎮採取行動。

是公開宣布李爲叛逆。李錡得到這一消息後，即於十一日派其兵馬使張子良、李奉先、田少卿等三人領軍三千襲擊宣歙。但這些鎮將已瞭解李錡控制諸州失敗，而各路藩鎮又準備進討的情況。所以聯合擔任牙將的李錡外甥裴行立在出發前倒戈。第十二日，李錡就在子良等人的聯合倒戈之下束手就擒了[114]。看來李錡原來的打算是首先利用衙兵來作出兵變的姿態，並通過控制屬下諸州和騷擾宣歙，來造成一片混亂的局面。使朝廷不得不留他在浙西以穩定局面。但他未必真有決心與朝廷公開對抗。而他失敗的關鍵在於未能對鎮內諸州府加以有效控制。當李錡下令各州鎮將對刺史採取行動時，各州刺史紛紛起來對抗，這在中晚唐是罕見的。江淮對唐廷的忠誠亦由此可見。李錡被押到長安後，憲宗和他有一段對話：

> 十一月，甲申朔，錡至長安，上御興安門，面詰之。對曰：「臣初不反，張子良等教臣耳。」上曰：「卿為元帥，子良等謀反，何不斬之，然後入朝？」錡無以對[115]。

雖然李錡和劉闢都在自己的藩鎮內起主導的作用，但在被俘後都不約而同的宣稱是爲鎮兵或牙軍所迫。這都是想以貞元以來的藩鎮擅權的慣有模式來爲自己開脫。但憲宗的乾脆回答顯示出這已不再成爲理由。李會不惜以策動兵變來自保的動機大概朝廷也早已洞察。但憲宗卻不惜一再向李施壓，終於使後者越發緊張，覺得只能鋌而走險。雖然對朝廷而言，平定浙西的勝算較大[116]，但這樣的策略畢竟有一定的冒險。可是

---

114 倒戈過程見《通鑑》，卷237，頁7642。《舊、新唐書》和《通鑑》將之記之於癸酉日，其實那是浙西露布到達長安的時間。實際發生時間應據元稹的文字。

115 同上，頁7643。

116 雖然浙西有相當的軍事力量，但其鄰近的藩鎮，諸如宣武、武寧、淮南等的軍力均強過浙西。《新唐書・李吉甫傳》稱吉甫建議調用武寧和宣武軍，就足以使浙西軍心瓦解(卷146，頁4740)。值得注意的是領頭倒戈的張子良和他的部屬恰恰就是原來武寧的舊部。

對憲宗而言，地方的安定已不足以犧牲其皇帝個人權威爲代價了。從憲宗處理劉闢事件的步步爲營到對付李錡時的堅決正可以看出他的新政治規範的影響日漸廣泛。李錡這一事件的獲得解決也果然出乎意料的順利，真所謂「天府無一金之費，以靜江流；王師無一戰之勞，已除人害」[117]。雖然李錡自身的缺乏謀略是重要原因，如此輕易的解決也不能不在很大的程度上歸功於憲宗時期新政治規範在輿論和實踐上和藩鎮所已產生的嚇阻作用。

結語

憲宗對西川及浙西兩大危機的妥善處理是其政治權威得以確立的基礎。憲宗所成就的並不僅僅是以軍事等方式來壓制藩鎮，而且也是改變了安史之亂之後，特別是德宗以來的政治遊戲的規則，並迫使藩鎮接受其新的規則。也就是說從這一刻起，評判一個藩鎮效忠朝廷與否的標準不再像貞元期間那樣模糊，不再是以在節度使權力交接之時，地方上自己產生的繼承人是否曾有功於朝廷，或是否表面(或實際)恭順，或是否會有利於地方局勢之穩定爲標準。而是以是否能無條件接受朝廷所直接指定的人選爲標準。忠誠與否端賴其接受皇命的程度而定。這種對政治意識的根本性扭轉必須在貞元的背景下觀察才更具有意義。而這層心理因素對日後的政治發展有深遠之影響。這一標準從此幾乎成爲唐廷和藩鎮關係的基本前提，而且大體維持到唐末黃巢之亂前爲止。這才是元和政治的首要貢獻。而在憲宗當政之初，其政策變化之迅速，可以說是大大出乎許多藩鎮的預料。劉闢和李錡就在這一急劇轉變的過程中多多少少成了「犧牲品」。因爲他們的心中都只有一個既有的模式，希冀能按原有的規則來達到目的。結果反而陷於被動。雖然現在遺留的歷史材料

117 見〈平李錡德音〉，載《唐大詔令集》，卷124，頁665。

大多已完全把劉、李當作叛逆來對待，但這種轉變在當時所造成的突兀以及當時的輿論和後來的不盡一致卻還是有蛛絲馬跡可循的。李肇《國史補》有一段李錡在被擒之後的記載：

> 李錡之擒也，侍婢一人隨之。錡夜則裂衿自書筦榷之，言為張子良所賣，教侍婢曰：「結之衣帶。吾若從容奏對，當為宰相，揚、益節度；不得，從容受極刑矣。吾死，汝必入內，上必問汝，汝當以此進之」，及錡伏法，京城三日大霧不開，或聞鬼哭，憲宗又得帛書，頗疑其冤，內出黃衣二襲賜錡及子，敕京兆府收葬之[118]。

李肇是李錡同時期的人，而且長期在中央擔任要職。《國史補》的記載往往很有價值，但這則記事是否真實則無從證實[119]。不過一方面他讓我們窺測到了當時對此事的一些看法：即使像李錡那樣公認的悍臣，也不無值得同情之處。另一方面這則記事中透露出來的李錡的心態也很有意思。在成爲階下囚之後，李錡還居然認爲他憑治鹽鐵之功，應有資格爲宰相或揚、益節度。這和上引史料中劉闢成爲階下囚之後飲食自若以爲罪不當死的記載有驚人的類似，也一樣不可思議。但這正說明無論是劉闢還是李錡，都對突如其來的政治規則的變化無法完全瞭解和接受。這種由對李錡表示同情的輿論所體現出來的道德價值和判斷的模糊性還體現在符載的例子上。在西蜀的幕僚中，符是在劉闢事件中捲入很深的一位。上文所引的重要文字便是證據。很多西蜀文職幕僚的仕途在劉闢失敗之後都有好的機緣，唯獨符不得高就。但有意思的是當元和

---

118 這一記載首見《國史補》中，頁40。又載入《南部新書》戊部，《唐語林》卷6及《通鑑》卷237考異(頁7643)。所謂的奏對大概就是他和憲宗的那段對話。

119 《通鑑》考異引「實錄」：「誅錡數日後，上遣中使齎黃衣二襲，命有司收其屍並男，以庶人禮葬焉」；亦見《新唐書》，卷224，頁6384。

五年荊南節度使趙宗儒辟符載爲幕僚時，柳宗元特意寫信向趙宗儒道賀。信中說：

> 伏聞以武都符載為記室。天下立志之士。雜然相顧。繼以嘆息。知為善者得其歸嚮。流言者有所間執。直道之所行。義風之所揚。堂堂焉實在荊山之南矣。幸甚幸甚。夫以符君之藝術志氣，為時聞人。才位未會。盤桓固久。中間因緣。陷在危邦。與時偃仰，不廢其道。而為見忌嫉者橫致唇吻。房給事以高節特立，明之于朝。王吏部以清議自任，辯之於外，然猶小人浮議，困在交戟。凡諸侯之欲得符君者，城聯讓接。而惑於騰沸。環視相讓，莫敢先舉。及受署之日，則開口垂臂，悵望悼悔。譬之求珠於海。而徑寸先得。則眾皆怏然罷去，知奇寶之有所歸也[120]。

在這篇文字中，柳對符大加褒揚，非但不認爲符載有任何過錯，而且還是讒言下的不幸者。那些批評符的人才是小人。符和劉闢的密切關係被宗元以「中間因緣」等數語帶過。柳不僅稱讚符載，他同時表彰當時已擔任給事中的房式和王吏部。稱房是「高節特立」。王吏部不知所指何人，但從上下文來看，恐怕也是原來西川幕府中人。符是出色的文人，也是柳宗元岳丈楊憑早期的好友，但柳對符毫無保留的讚揚應不只是因爲他對符才能的欣賞或對趙宗儒的恭維。而多少表明當時西川事件的性質並不單純。同時如果比照韋乾度對房式的批評和史料上房式將劉闢比作劉備，而爲同僚所不齒的記載，宗元對房式的評價真成了驚人之語。連反駁韋乾度的批評而爲房式辯護的太常博士李虞仲都承認房式在

---

120 柳宗元，〈賀趙江陵宗儒辟符載啓〉，載《柳河東集》，卷35，頁559。

西蜀之所為「故非愛之者所能粉飾」[121]。這種種不同的議論表明即使在士大夫中間，對「忠」這一概念的尺度也並非完全一致的。這也是中晚唐價值觀紊亂的徵兆。連受儒家思想影響至深的柳宗元都如此，更遑論他人。

憲宗在劍南和浙西的成功對所有藩鎮的領導階層在心理上都造成了重大壓力。使他們不得不考慮自身行為會產生的後果。所以元和二年之後，強藩的節帥像山南東道的于頔，荊南的裴均，紛紛入朝，許多藩鎮也不得不接受朝廷指定的節帥人選。至元和四年，憲宗對江淮、劍南和長江中游的重要區域如山南東道和荊南的控制進一步得到穩固。這一發展最終影響到了河北藩鎮。以往對憲宗平藩的研究過分強調其戰爭的勝利，而忽視了憲宗通過政治輿論而造成的「勢」的作用絕不下於其他方面。使得憲宗對包括河北在內的地方的要求成為理所當然。其次，通過這兩次事件，元和時代新的中樞成員也得以產生。在此期間湧現出來的最主要的人物無疑是李吉甫。在討蜀期間擔任翰林承旨的李吉甫是幫助憲宗策劃的中心人物，實際的作用恐怕遠過宰相杜黃裳。其貢獻在當時是得到公認的。而且尤其讓憲宗銘感在心[122]。所以討蜀勝利後不久杜黃裳便被調任河中。中央大局由李吉甫主持。從此李與憲宗互為依傍，直至元和九年李病死為止。這種君臣合作在中晚唐極為難得，實際上比後來裴度和憲宗之間遠為順暢。所以元和既是憲宗的時代，也可以不誇張的說是李吉甫的時代。第二個重要政治人物則是武元衡。武和李同時被命為相，討平李錡便是在兩人執政期間的成就。武在對李錡問題上的強硬主張和後來治蜀的成就使他也成為除李之外最受憲宗信賴的大臣。對於憲宗本人而言，雖說他在中晚唐的歷史上的大名是靠著平定淮西和淄青而確立。但如果我們讀一下韓愈在元和二年所作之《元和聖德

---

121 李虞仲的議論見《唐會要》，卷80〈謚法下〉，頁1744-5。

122 見〈李吉甫平章事制〉(《唐大詔令集》，卷46，頁229)；又武元衡，〈祭李吉甫文〉有「南定句吳，西殲邛僰」等語(《全唐文》，卷531，頁2387)。

詩》，就會發現韓愈當時已作出「太平之期，適當今日」的歡呼。所以不用等到平定淮西和淄青，憲宗作爲了不起的中興之主的名聲就已開始深入人心了。

Praying to the Spirit of Confucius and Claiming the Transmission of the Way: Linking Zhu Xi's Views on *Guishen* and the *Daotong*

Hoyt Cleveland Tillman
Professor of Department of History, Arizona State University

The field of Zhu Xi studies has gradually, but progressively, changed during the last three decades. Influenced by East Asian traditionalists, North American scholars in the 1970s continued to portray Zhu Xi (1130-1200) as a moral philosopher and usually as a purely rationalistic one. Of course, the prevailing view within the PRC in the 1970s was much more critical of his philosophical 'idealism' and supposed lack of patriotic concern for national unification, i.e., the need to liberate North China from the Jurchen conquerors of his day. Nonetheless, scholars in China also regarded Zhu Xi primarily as a philosopher. A major similarity between these approaches was evident in the first international Zhu Xi conference (1982 in Hawaii), when

many of the papers from various countries wrestled with abstract topics, particularly *wuji er taiji* (the Non-Ultimate and yet the Supreme Ultimate), as issues in speculative philosophy or metaphysics.[1] Even though these prevailing currents also swept me along, I sometimes swam against this mainstream. For instance, my 1982 book sought to demonstrate, contrary to established interpretation, that Zhu Xi's debate with Chen Liang over the *dao* (Way) was not over metaphysical philosophy, but rather arose from a practical conflict of views about the impact of historical change on cultural values, the legitimacy of expedient sociopolitical concerns in ethics, and the role models suitable for scholar-officials in addressing problems of their day. I also illustrated Zhu Xi's and Chen Liang's fundamental differences through a discussion of a pressing political policy issue--the question of war against the Jurchen to restore North China to native Chinese control under the Song dynasty.[2] My 1992 book set Zhu Xi's intellectual evolution and ideas in the context of social relations and exchanges with friends and rivals within the *Daoxue* fellowship; moreover, points of contention and interaction included academies, granaries and sociopolitical policies.[3] Still, even though the fundamental theme was how Zhu Xi had striven to be regarded as the authoritative voice within the fellowship and the authoritative reader of tradition, the book largely dealt with philosophical issues. Fortunately, Professor Yu Yingshi's book on Zhu Xi (currently in press) achieves a

1 See the volume of papers by senior participants compiled by Wing-tsit Chan, ed., *Chu Hsi and Neo-Confucianism* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986).

2 Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, *Utilitarian Confucianism: Ch'en Liang's Challenge to Chu Hsi* (Harvard East Asian Monograph Series, 101. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).

3 Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, *Confucian Discourse and Chu Hsi's Ascendancy* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1992).

breakthrough in demonstrating that Song sociopolitical issues were more primary or fundamental--than speculative or moral philosophies--to Zhu Xi.[4] I personally expect that Professor Yu's book will shift currents within the mainstream of Zhuzi studies and will have an even more profound impact upon the field than Professor Qian Mu's *Zhuzi xin xue'an*. Arguably it was Professor Qian's five volumes (more than any other studies) that laid the groundwork for a turn toward positive evaluations of Zhu Xi's thought by Asian scholars during the last quarter of the 20th century.

Even though I expect a major shift in Zhuzi studies in the wake of Professor Yu Yingshi's book, I would presently like to return to an earlier theme to fill in a lacuna in Zhuzi studies, or at least a missing link in my own thesis about Zhu Xi's assertion of authority. My point of departure is Professor Yu's 1987 *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* article on the *fu* ritual of calling back the *hun* spirit of recently deceased family members.[5] I will also build upon particularly noteworthy recent scholarship[6] on Zhu's

---

4 Yu Yingshi, *Zhu Xi de lishi shijie* (Taibei: Yunchen wenhua gongsi). I am indebted to Professor Yu for conversations about his forthcoming book.

5 Ying-shih Yu, "O Soul, Come Back! A Study in the Changing Conceptions of the Soul and Afterlife in Pre-Buddhist China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 47 (1987): 365-395. See also Anthony C. Yu's helpful bibliographaic survey and study in the same 1987 *HJAS*, "Rest, Rest Perturbed Spirit! Ghosts in Traditional Chinese Prose Fiction."

6 I am particularly indebted both to Yung Sik Kim's *The Natural Philosophy of Chu His, 1130-1200* (Philadelphia: Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 2000), which helped me to expand my discussion of several points, and also to current work by Lionel M. Jensen, "Ruins of Remembrance: Image, Text and the Generative Ficiton of the Chinese Past," paper presented at University of California, Berkeley (October, 1998); and his "When Words Move Stones: Figures, Fictions, and the Chinese Past" (Sabbatical grant proposal and book proposal, 1999). See also Daniel Gardner, "Ghosts and Spirits in the Sung Neo-Confucian World: Chu Hsi on *Kuei-shen*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115.4 (1995), and his "Zhu Xi

discussion of *guishen* (ghosts and spirits) that might be used to point toward a new level of possible significance in evolving research in this area. Even though some would regard any discussion of Zhu Xi's view of ghosts and spirits as 'religious' discourse and therefore tangential to Zhuzi studies, my purpose is not to categorize Zhu Xi's statement as falling within the modern Western conceptual category of 'religion' (rendered into Chinese as *zongjiao*). Rather, what I seek is to provide an example of how Zhu Xi and his thought are more complex than retrospective optimized idealizations and rationalistic systemizations have often suggested. In the process, I will be stepping into the gap between my 1987 *HJAS* article on a possible role of consciousness of *tian* (*tianxin*) in Zhu Xi's thinking,[7] on the one hand, and

(續)

on Spirit Beings," in Donald S. Lopez, Jr., ed., *Chinese Religions in Practice* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Yong Sik Kim, "*Kuei-shen* in terms of *Ch'i*: Chu Hsi's Discussion of *Kuei-shen*," *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* 17 (1985): 149-62. For a more New Confucian reading of many of *guishen* passages, see Joseph A. Adler, "Varieties of Spiritual Experience: *Shen* in Neo-Confucian Discourse," in Tu Wei-ming and Mary Evelyn Tucker, eds., *Confucian Spirituality* (New York: Crossroads Press, forthcoming).

7 Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, "Consciousness of *T'ien* in Chu Hsi's Thought," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 47.1 (June 1987): 31-50. This article's odyssey reflects the difficulty of writing about Zhu's 'mystical' side at a time when the field was almost totally dominated by the prevailing view of Zhu as a purely rational philosopher. When I submitted this manuscript, the journal's referee, Porfessor Wing-tsit Chan, sternly objected that Zhu had probably never used such a term as *tianxin*, so I probably had simply produced a confused abbreviation of the established philosophical term *tiandi zhi xin* (the mind of Heaven and Earth). A few months later when I happened to meet Professor Chan in Changsha on my way to the Yuelu shuyuan, he brought up my essay and charged me with distorting Zhu's thought in an effort to transform Zhu into a religious figure like the Christian missionaries had sometimes done. After I explained the intent and content of my essay, he agreed to read Zhu's passages on *tianxin* if I would send him Xerox copies. Thus began an exchange of letters that led to greater mutual understanding. Professor Chan soon acknowledged that Zhu had actually used the term and even conceded about two

my 1992 book about Zhu Xi's struggle for ascendancy, on the other hand. Specifically, I will explore what we might learn by juxtaposing and linking two distinct areas or categories of Zhu Xi's comments: those on ghosts or spirits (*guishen*) and those on the transmission and succession of the Way (*daotong*). Professor Qian Mu's *Zhuzi xin xue'an* and most other major studies have understandably focused on Zhu Xi's discussion of *guishen* as contractive (negative) and expansive (positive) cosmic forces within Zhu's rationalistic system of metaphysical philosophy.[8] Nevertheless, what might we learn about Zhu Xi's thinking by focusing on relatively more traditional aspects of *guishen*, as ghosts and spirits, and his novel use of such traditional notions?

1. Ghosts and Spirits

Among the numerous studies of ghosts and spirits in traditional China, Professor Yingshi Yu's 1987 article on summoning recently departed souls provides a particularly relevant point of departure. Besides explaining the range and evolution of views in China before the impact of Buddhism, the article highlights the elements of what would eventually become mainstream 'Confucian' assumptions.[9] Before the sixth century B.C., people in North

(续)

years later that I had made a plausible case for how the concept might fit in Zhu's system. Despite his continuing skepticism about my argument, Professor Chan graciously withdrew his objections to *HJAS* publishing my revised manuscript. Even though Professor Chan continued to deny any philosophical significance to *tianxin*, he interjected a short paragraph on the term in his own *Chu Hsi: New Studies* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989), p. 192.

8 See particularly Qian Mu, *Zhuzi xin xue'an* (Taibei: Sanmin shuju, 1971); and Wing-tsit Chan, *Chu Hsi*.

9 On orthodox Confucian view, see Qian Mu, *Linghun yu xin* (Taibei: Lianjing

China regarded the *po* as the human soul. According to Professor Yu's survey, the *po* was regarded "as the soul of the man, something that when taken away, by heaven, causes the man to lose his intelligence. Clearly, the *po* must have been conceived as a separate entity which joins the body from outside."[10] The notion of *hun* as the active, vital soul within people probably first arose in South China and, by the end of the sixth century B.C., began penetrating cultural conceptions in North China. For instance, in 516 B.C., a court official of the state of Song (in eastern Henan) predicted the impending deaths of two men who had failed to respond to a situation with the appropriate emotions:

> I have heard that joy in the midst of grief and grief in the midst of joy are signs of a loss of mind (or heart, *xin*). The essential vigor and brightness of the mind is what we call the *hun* and the *po*. When these leave it, how can the man continue long?[11]

At first, people were uncertain about how these two components were related. In 534 B.C. people in the state of Zheng were alarmed when the ghost of a nobleman, Boyou, returned to take revenge on his murderers for depriving

(續)

chubanshe, 1976). I use 'Confucian' not as an eponym for Chinese tradition, but rather as an artifice for distinguishing some textual communities or strands of intellectuals--who regarded their culture as rooted in the ancient classics ascribed to Kongzi, i.e., our 'Confucius' (551-479 B.C.E.)--from other literati associated primarily with other Chinese traditions, most notably various sects of Buddhism and Daoism.

10 Y.S. Yu, 371.

11 Y.S. Yu, 371, quoting the *Zuo zhuan : The Ch'un Ts'ew with the Tso chuen*, in James Legge, tr., *The Chinese Classics*, 5 vols. (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1961 reprint), 5: 708.

him not only of his life but also of his hereditary office and thus his spirit of sacrificial offerings. To satisfy this 'hungry ghost' so that it would disappear, the wise statesman Zi Chan (581-521 BC) placed Boyou's son in the father's former office. Zi Chan's success stirred questions regarding what a ghost is and how a ghost could disturb the human world. In his response, Zi Chan set forth what centuries later was to become regarded as "the *locus classicus* on the subject of the human soul in the Chinese tradition." Zi Chan explained:

> When man is born, that which is first created is called the *po* and, when the *po* has been formed, its positive part (*yang*) becomes *hun* or conscious spirit.
>
> In case a man is materially well and abundantly supported, then his *hun* and *po* grow very strong, and therefore produce spirituality and intelligence. Even the *hun* and *po* of an ordinary man or woman, having encountered violent death, can attach themselves to other people to cause extraordinary troubles... The stuff Boyou was made of was copious and rich, and his family great and powerful. Is it not natural that, having met with a violent death, he should be able to become a ghost?[12]

As Professor Yu notes, Zi Chan's extensive explanation suggests that this was his own view, rather than one widely shared in his day; moreover, even though *hun* and *po* were linked, *hun* was here derivative of the *po*. Furthermore,

12 *Zuo zhuan* in Legge, 5: 618. The translation here is an adaptation of Professor Yu's adaptation of Alfred Forke, *Lun Heng* (New York: Paragon, rpt. 1962), 1: 208-209.

even though Zi Chan's statement later became 'the orthodox doctrine' regarding *hun* and *po* in Confucian philosophy, "it was not the view to be accepted by the common man in China in subsequent, especially Han, times."[13]

By Han times, a thoroughly dualistic conception of the soul definitively had been formulated. According to the *Book of Rites* (*Liji*), "The breath-soul (*hunqi*) returns to heaven; the bodily soul (*xingpo*) returns to earth. Therefore, in sacrificial-offering one should seek the meaning in the *yin-yang* principle."[14] As Professor Yu explains, this passage demonstrates that by Han times, it became widely accepted that the *hun* belonged to the active and heavenly substance associated with the *yang* category, and the *po* belonged to the passive and earthly substance associated with the *yin*. Moreover, upon the body's death, the souls went in opposite directions: The lighter breath-soul or *hun* moved quickly toward the heavens, while the heavier bodily soul or *po* passed slowly downward into the earth. Hence, in the *fu* ritual, ancient Chinese summoned the *hun* soul, but never the *po*. Although *qi*, in a general sense, as the 'breath' or 'source of life' or 'energy' permeated everything within the cosmos, it became a widely-held belief during Han times that the bodily soul or *po* consisted of a grosser *qi* in contrast to the refined, heavenly *qi* of the *hun* soul. The two souls had different functions within the body. Zheng Xuan (127-200) certainly articulated a long-standing conception, and one shared with Han Daoists, when he said that *qi* or the *hun* soul was the basis of man's spirit and intelligence, while the *po* soul functioned in hearing and seeing.[15]

---

13 Y.S. Yu, 372-373.

14 Y.S. Yu, 374, citing *Liji zhusu* (*Shisanjing zhusu*, 1815 edition). For an translation of the *Book of Rites*, see James Legge, *The Texts of Confucianism*, Part III: *The Li Ki*, 2 vols., in F. Max Muller, ed., *Sacred Books of the East* (London: Pobsthain, 1917).

15 Y.S. Yu, 376, citing *Liji zhusu*, 47.14a-15a; see also Professor Yu's discussion, 374-377.

The dualistic conception of the soul with the *hun* going heavenward and the *po* sinking into the earth also related to ancient Chinese assumptions about a heavenly world or court above and an underworld below, which was early referred to as the 'Yellow Springs' (*huang quan*). It was further believed that a dead person's spirit (*gui*) required food presented in sacrificial offerings; moreover, since descendants were of the same *qi* as the deceased, it was crucial that the sacrificial offerings be made by descendants. If such offerings were not received, the *gui* could not only seek revenge or retribution but also be unable to serve as a medium for auspicious *qi*. Since the soul could not survive indefinitely and depended upon materialistic factors, preservation of the corpse became a high priority in burials. Furthermore, as the notion of immortals (*xian*) became popular during the Han, it was believed that some individuals could harness heavenly *qi* to transform their body and gain longevity. As these immortals were assumed to ascend to heaven eventually, there was a need for a new destination for the *hun* souls of ordinary mortals. The abode for *hun* souls became associated with Liangfu, a small hill near the sacred Mt. Tai in Shandong, so this site became the capital of the governor of the dead, i.e., their *hun* souls. This hill had earlier been the spot where sacrifices were made to the supreme earthy deity (*dizhu*), who was transformed into the lord of the underworld (*dixiazhu*). The abode for *po* souls became associated with a place at the foot of the Liangfu hill and fell under a separate jurisdiction of underworld government in a court of ghosts, imagined as either in Gaoli or the ancient Yellow Springs. As the Han Confucian text, the "Meaning of Sacrifice" (*Jiyi*), succinctly stated: " [After death] the name of *hun* in life is changed to *shen* and that of *po* to *gui*."[16] In

16 Y.S. Yu, 393, note 80, quoting and citing Kong Yingda's *Zhengyi in Zuozhuan zhusu*

summary, all of these ideas and correlations comprised early Chinese notions of the soul and afterlife before Buddhism had its profound impact on China.

I would acknowledge, however, that actual burial customs and beliefs varied considerably in the diverse cultural landscape of China: for instance, instead of striving to preserve the corpse, some communities in southeast China enhanced the rate of the corpse's decay and then exhumed and washed the bones before reburial. Still, Professor Yu's account of pre-Buddhist beliefs provides a baseline for understanding what Zhu Xi sought to regain as a foundation for a 'Confucian' alternative to the Buddhist practices and beliefs that dominated his own day.

Zhu Xi used the term *guishen* to refer to a wide range of mysterious and subtle things and events:

> Rain, wind, dew, and thunder, the sun, the moon, day, and night--all these are 'traces'(*ji*) of *guishen*. These are 'the fair, even, correct, and straight' (*gong, ping, zheng, zhi*) *guishen* of the bright day. For example, what are called, 'ghosts howling from the house beams and striking people's chests,' refer to those *guishen* that are 'incorrect, wicked, and dark' (*buzheng, xie, an*), 'sometimes existing and sometimes not,' 'sometimes going and sometimes coming,' and 'sometimes aggregating and sometimes dispersing.' There are also sayings that offering a prayer to them, it is responded to, and addressing a wish to them, it is obtained. And all of these are the

(續)

(*Shisanjing zhushu*, 1815 edition), 44.13a-14a; see also Professor Yu's discussion, pp. 378-393.

> same *li*. The myriad things and events in the world are all this *li*; there only are differences of being exquisite or coarse, and small or large.[17]

In the first sense, *guishen* referred to the natural function and operation of all things in the universe. Utilizing the notion of correct and proper *guishen*, Zhu Xi pointed to nature's spontaneous, but still mysterious, operations, such as the regularity or constancy of the seasons and the growth cycle of plants. This sense of *guishen* as contractive and expansive forces in all phenomena is what most studies of Zhu Xi's statements on *guishen* have discussed, because their focus has been his philosophical system.

In the second and more restricted sense, Zhu Xi used *guishen* to refer to markedly mysterious and particularly unfathomable phenomena, such as 'ghost whistles and ghost fires.'[18] Zhu Xi discussed such ghosts and monsters not only because some passages in the classics had mentioned them but also because he was willing to concede that the testimony of later people about ghosts could be accepted as partially true. On several occasions, he specifically addressed the case of Boyou and endorsed Zi Chan's interpretation, which Professor Yu presented as the *locus classicus* of orthodox Confucian views.[19] Zhu Xi echoed Zi Chan's interpretation of ghosts. Explaining that the vital energy (*qi*) of some people lingered, especially if they had met violent deaths and thus sought revenge, Zhu Xi

17 Zhu Xi, *Zhuzi yulei* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition, 1986), 3.34-35; for some passages traditional page numbers (within parentheses) will be provided for the Taibei: Zhengzhong shuju edition, 1962; translation adapted from Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 92.

18 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.37, tr. Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 93.

19 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.37, 38, 41, 44, 45, 49, and 63.1551.

said:

> In most cases it is a matter of people meeting an untimely death either by drowning, killing, or sudden illness. Because their *qi* hasn't yet exhausted itself, it transforms itself into these creatures. Furthermore, in the cases of sudden death, the *qi* does not disperse entirely; this is because the original endowment of *qi* is generous. But, in the end, over time, it will completely disperse.[20]

As long as the *qi* of such persons did not disperse, it could produce strange effects: "Monstrous and evil ghosts are often those from undispersed *qi* after death; therefore, the *qi* is pent-up and congealed to form the monstrous and evil."[21] In some cases, such evil effects could be destroyed through firecrackers, which helped to disperse the *qi*.[22] Although most cases of residual *qi* becoming ghosts arose from either being killed or committing suicide, Zhu Xi also said that an individual could have such flourishing *qi* that it was not dispersed even upon a normal death.[23] Similarly, based on the *Zuo zhuan*, Zhu Xi accepted the story that one person possessed such loyalty that upon death, his *qi* became an emerald.[24] Moreover, Zhu Xi conceded that spirit mediums (*wu*, often classed as shamans) and cult worship were not without efficacy in dealing with ghosts, because the *qi* in people's minds activated and interacted with ghosts and spirits. In other words, "there is a

20 *Zhuzi yulei*, 63.1551 (25b); tr. Gardner, "Ghosts," 603. See also 3.43, 44.

21 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.45 (10b); tr. Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 94.

22 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.38 (5b).

23 *Zhuzi yulei*, 63.1551 (25b); Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 94.

24 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.45; Zhang Heng's story is in the *Zuo zhuan*, the third year of Aikong, see also Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 94, n. 45.

resonance between similar *qi*, and thus the spirit attaches itself to these people."[25]

As evident in such examples, even though Zhu Xi accepted the existence of ghosts, he sought to provide a rational explanation within his philosophical system by discussing strange ghosts in terms of *qi*, especially 'incorrect or abnormal' (*buzheng*) *qi*. He rarely rejected strange things and events, if reportedly seen by people. For instance, he responded to one disciple's skepticism about strange phenomena with the retort: "It is merely that you have never seen them."[26] Zhu Xi's receptivity to stories of ghosts and strange phenomena show that he was clearly influenced by traditional notions and the cultural environment in Fujian, especially in his base area near Wuyishan. Fujian was among the areas where belief in spirits and lore about strange phenomena were particularly strong. Although he quoted and approved of skeptical statements from the classics, such as "keep ghosts and spirits at a distance,"[27] he certainly found it more difficult than classical Confucians to remain aloof from discussions of ghosts. After all, he was deliberately competing with Buddhists, Daoists, and spirit mediums not only for what he regarded as proper social customs but also for people's heart and minds. Zhu Xi's philosophy of *li* (conventionally glossed as 'principle') and *qi* provided him a basis for rejecting 'superstitious' beliefs about strange phenomena. For instance, by arguing that especially violent deaths produced ghosts, he was denying the Buddhist notion that rebirth of the dead person's soul was routine or the norm. Moreover, by demanding that cults be judged by the morals they encouraged among believers, he could advocate the

25 *Zhuzi yulei*, 90.2310 (18b); tr. Gardner, "Ghosts," 604.

26 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.35; tr.Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 100.

27 *Analects*, 6/20; see discussion in Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 100.

suppression of what he regarded as 'licentious cults.'

In the third sense mentioned above by Zhu Xi, *guishen* referred to that to which one offered prayers and from which responses came. Because this category centered on (but not restricted to) the spirits of deceased ancestors, *guishen* in this sense was what Zhu Xi most often addressed in his discussions with students. Ancestral spirits and their responses to sacrificial services were crucial to Confucians and their family-centered values, including filial piety. Zhu Xi's statements reveal his allegiance to major aspects of what Professor Yu described as views that evolved from antiquity through the Han era. For instance, Zhu Xi approved of Zi Chan's saying that the *po* was prior to the *hun*.[28] Zhu Xi also associated the *po* with the body's clarity of seeing and hearing, but the *hun* with the *qi* or breath within the throat.[29] As the *Book of Rites* had done, Zhu Xi presented the *hun* soul as returning to 'Heaven' (*tian*), but the *po* soul returning to earth to dissipate.[30] (It is important to note that Zhu apparently set aside the Han development of the concept of the *hun* soul departing to the realm of Liangfu; thus, Heaven was his single focus point for contact with the spirits.) A person's heavenly *hun* soul could linger, or hover around, and be contacted by his descendants during the rites of sacrifice to the ancestor. Here, the general principle of resonance within the realm of vital energy was enhanced because of the specific biological relationship and affinity between blood relatives, particularly on the patrilineal side. Addressing inquiries about the existence of ancestral spirits and the importance of shared *qi*, Zhu Xi remarked:

---

28 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.49.

29 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.45.

30 For example, *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.37, 38, 45.

> In the end, the descendants are of the same *qi* as the ancestors, so even though the ancestors' *qi* may have dispersed, their roots nonetheless exists right here. By fully exercising sincerity and reverence, we're able to summon their *qi* so that it coalesces right here.[31]

The word 'roots' (*gen*) might be glossed here as the 'blood-line' of the ancestors because ancestors and descendants had the same *qi* passed from father to son over the generations.[32]

As implicit in Zhu Xi's statement, an important issue for discussion with his students was: Since a deceased person's *qi* dispersed, how could descendants reach the ancestors through the sacrificial service? The answer centered on the particular *qi* that descendants shared with the ancestors. For instance, he explained:

> When a man dies, although his *qi* eventually returns to [the state of] dispersion, there also is [some part that is] not dispersed or exhausted. Therefore, the sacrificial service has the *li* of reaching and moving [the ancestor]. Whether the *qi* of an ancestor of a generation far removed [still] exists or not, it is not possible to know. But since the person who offers the sacrificial service is his descendant, [their *qi*] must be the same *qi*, and therefore there is the *li* of stimulation and penetration [of the ancestor].[33]

31 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.47; tr.adapted from Gardner, "Ghosts," 608.

32 *Zhuzi yulei*, 63.1546.

33 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.37; tr. Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 94-95.

The particular *qi* inherited from ancestors was so crucial that Zhu Xi reasoned: "The ancestor's *qi* exists only when the descendant's *qi* exists; however, when it is not the time of sacrificial service, how can it be aggregated?"[34]

Zhu Xi insisted that only a proper patrilineal descendant could evoke the ancestor's spirit; this pronouncement was in line with traditional warnings (e.g., *Analects* 2/24) that it was vain and useless to sacrifice to someone else's ancestor. For instance, Zhu Xi gave his philosophical basis to support a claim in the *Zuo zhuan*: "The reason 'spirits do not enjoy the offerings of those not their kindred and people do not sacrifice to those not their ancestry' is simply that their *qi* are not related."[35]

By championing the classical dictum about sacrificing only to one's ancestors, Zhu Xi sought to thwart the customary practice of burning incense to Buddhist and Daoist deities; however, Zhu Xi himself made offerings and even built shrines to people who were not related to him biologically. The precedent for doing so went back to the classic *Book of Rites*, which allowed sacrifices to one's teachers. Zhang Shi (1133-1180), and subsequently Zhu Xi, expanded upon this tradition to provide a reasoned basis for building shrines to local worthies. Further extending this precedent, Zhang Shi and Zhu Xi built shrines to Zhou Dunyi (1017-1073) and the brothers, Cheng Hao (1032-1086) and Cheng Yi (1033-1107), even in areas where they had never sojourned, in order to establish their claim to have revived and transmitted the *dao* (Way) of the ancient sages.[36] Around the same time,

34 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.50; tr. adapted from Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 96.

35 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.47; tr. Gardner, "Ghosts," 607-608.

36 Ellen G. Neskar, "The Cult of Worthies: A Study of Shrines Honoring Local Confucian Worthies in the Sung Dynasty (960-1279)," Ph. D. thesis, Columbia

they promoted similar shrines honoring the statesman and military leader Zhuge Liang(181-234).[37] Thus, even though their shrines primarily promoted worthies within the Learning of the Way (*Daoxue*) tradition, they did not restrict themselves to worthies from that tradition.

Writing to commemorate the 1177 restoration of Zhou Dunyi's study, Zhu Xi presented Kongzi ('Confucius')as setting forth the idea that sages received the *dao* directly from Heaven. Referring to *Analects* 9/5, Zhu commented: "And Confucius always ascribed the rise and decline of 'this culture' (*siwen*) to Heaven. It is clear that the sage has not deceived us in this regard. Was not Master Lianxi [Zhou Dunyi] one who attained the transmission of the Way through the bestowal of Heaven?"[38] (This passage should be kept in mind during our subsequent discussions of Zhu Xi's own contact with the spirits of Zhou Dunyi and Confucius.) Zhu Xi further sought to establish a parallel between Zhou Dunyi's *Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate* (*Taijitu*) and the work of the legendary ancient sage Fu Xi. Referring to the account in the "Xici zhuan" of the *Book of Changes* (*Yijing*)

(续)

University, 1993; I have not benefited from the revisions that she has made in the process of turning the dissertation into a book manuscript forthcoming from the East Asian Monograph Series at Harvard. Professor Neskar's research, along with Patricia Ebrey's, provides much evidence that Zhu's views of ancestral rites and shrines to worthies beyond one's own kindred were often inspired and impacted by his contemporaries, especially Zhang Shi and Lü Zuqian (1137-1181). Thus, despite the limits of the present paper, we should remember that Zhu's ideas were formed not only in response to classical and Northern Song texts, but also through interactions with his contemporaries.

37 See, for instance, the examples in Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, "One Significant Rise in Chu-ko Liang's Popluarity: An Impact of the 1127 Jurchen Conquest," *Hanxue yanjiu* (*Chinese Studies*) 14.2 (December 1996), especially 13-16.

38 Zhu Xi, *Zhuzi ji* (Chengdu: Sichuan jiaoyu chubanshe, 1996), 78: 4074; tr. Neskar, 352.

about how Fu Xi had conceived the eight trigrams, Zhu Xi presented both Fu Xi and Zhou Dunyi as having directly perceived the *dao* and mediated between Heaven and Earth.[39] Moreover, at the end of his pilgrimage to Zhou Dunyi's study on Mt. Lu in 1181, Zhu Xi wrote a ballad that culminated in these lines:

> The master is silent, wordless,
> My tears pour down.
> If the spirit is listening and does not reject me,
> I believe the benefit will be immeasurable.[40]

Here, Zhu Xi reveals his own direct interaction and communication with Zhou Dunyi's spirit.

It was on this pilgrimage during which he communed with Zhou Dunyi's spirit that Zhu Xi coined the term *daotong* (the succession to, and transmission of, the Way); that concept conveyed Zhu Xi's claim to special access to the Way of the ancient sages. Zhu Xi's shrines counterpoised the Song state's Confucian Temples that had enshrined and given special status to Wang Anshi (1021-1086), the great nemesis of the Learning of the Way fellowship. As a kind of counter culture, shrines established by Zhu Xi and his associates borrowed much of the organizational patterns and sacrificial rites performed in the state's temples, in order to challenge and eventually change the symbolism and message arising from Confucian temples of their era. After decades struggling against government opposition, the Learning of

---

39 Neskar, 386-388.

40 Zhu Xi, *Zhuzi daquan* (*Sibu beiyao* edition of Zhu's *wenji*; rpt. Taibei, 1970), 7:17a; tr. Neskar, 389.

the Way fellowship eventually succeeded in convincing the government both to remove Wang Anshi and to enshrine Zhu Xi and other *Daoxue* masters beginning in 1241.[41]

II. An Excursion into a Possible Relationship between *Guishen* and the *Daotong*

Building upon this connection between Zhu Xi's coining the term *daotong* and his communion with Zhou Dunyi's spirit, I wish to explore further evidence of a relationship between Zhu Xi's statements about spirits and the *daotong*--even though these are generally regarded as totally separate areas of his thought. In terms of recent scholarship, I could set my inquiry against the backdrop of two observations. First, Thomas Wilson locates the origins of the *daotong* imagery as a filiative genealogy structure by Zhu Xi in response to Chan Buddhist lineage projects.[42] Second, Ellen Neskar says that both family genealogies and Chan lineages presented an uninterrupted line of transmission, while Northern Song thinkers had long accepted the idea that the transmission of the *dao* had been interrupted since antiquity.[43]

However, the work of social historians, as I understand it, has shown that the newly risen Song literati lineages were indeed broken or at least difficult to trace with any specificity back many generations beyond the tenth

---

41 See particularly Huang Jinxing, *You ru sheng yu* (Taibei: Yunchen wenhua gongsi, 1994) on the history of struggles between emperors and scholars over the Confucian Temple. On the struggle during the Song, see Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, *Confucian Discourse and Chu His's Ascendancy* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1992), especially chapter 10; and Neskar, chapter 6.

42 Thomas A. Wilson, *Genealogy of the Way* (Stanford, 1995).

43 Neskar, 302-303.

century. Having relatively recently risen into elite ranks with resources to commemorate and maintain records of early ancestors, these literati probably felt a filial compulsion toward retrieval and remembrance. In other words, the fact that most family genealogical records had gaps might have influenced Song men's conception of how the transmission of the *dao* was retrievable. I will briefly explore my hypothesis in the case of Zhu Xi to see if his comments on *guishen* lend any light to his articulation of the *daotong* as a transformation of Song notions of a long-interrupted transmission of the *dao*. Another way of framing this inquiry would be: What are some of the signs that Zhu Xi might have regarded canonical rites for ancestors and teachers to provide insufficient spiritual empowerment and thus sought enhanced communion with the dead? Although the evidence is fragmentary, I believe a pattern becomes discernible as we progress through several points.

First, Zhu Xi's experiences with his own ancestors might have influenced his views and heightened his sensitivity to the need to address the issue of *guishen*. Zhu Xi's own father's and grandfather's remains were not returned to their native place, but rather were buried near Buddhist cloisters in areas where they resided at the time of their deaths. The father selected these sites near Buddhist cloisters even though he is highly regarded as devoted to the Confucian teachings of Cheng brothers and the Learning of the Way. Before passing away, Zhu Xi's father arranged for local friends in the Liu and Hu families to take care of his orphans and widow; indeed, the Liu family played a major role in supporting, educating, and forging marriage alliances with orphaned Zhu Xi and his sister. So integrated was Zhu Xi with the Liu family in Fujian that he apparently had little contact with his patrilineal relatives in Wuyuan county (in Huizhou prefecture) until his first visit to his ancestral graves at age 21 *sui*. His visit apparently moved

him profoundly because he donated his father's 100 *mu* of land there to maintain the ancestral graves. Later, when his mother died when he was almost 40, Zhu Xi did not follow canonical tradition of burying her beside his father, but rather interned her about 100 *li* (i.e., about 50 kilometers) away from her husband. Later on, when Zhu Xi did exhume his father, Zhu Xi did not rebury him beside his wife, but rather at another location. As one Qing era *biji* remarked, among the great scholars in the Southern Song dynasty there were many who buried their father and mother separately, and so this practice could be followed as a model.[44] Thus, Zhu Xi apparently was not alone in this burial practice, and such Song precedents were deemed noteworthy. Professor Zhu Jieren pointed out to me while visiting Zhu Xi's tomb in October of 2000 that Zhu Xi selected a particularly auspicious site for his own grave and another auspicious site elsewhere for the tomb of his wife. They benefited from occupying more than one strategic or crucial *qi* location. Zhu Xi's choice of these sites was determined by a careful study of geomancy.

Selecting an improper burial site, Zhu Xi believed, would subject the corpse to depleting underground winds that would lead to the financial ruin of the descendants. For instance, in an 1194 memorial, his protest against the gravesite selected for Xiaozong (reigned 1163-1189) included the following rationale:

> If the body is whole, the spirit (*shenling*) will attain peace, then the descendants will flourish and the sacrifices will not be cut off.

44 *Lüyuan conghua* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju edition), 5: 141. Achim Mittag brought this passage to my attention.

> This is a principle of how things spontaneously happen (*ziran zhi li*) ...
>
> Should the selection be defective, making the spot inauspicious, then there will surely be water, ants, and ground wind that will damage the contents and cause the body and spirit to be uncomfortable. And descendants will also have worries about death and extinction [of the descent line], which are very scary.[45]

Zhu Xi's sensitivity to gravesites was surely intertwined with his feelings at the beginning of his teenage years when he lost his father and was suddenly forced into manhood. As the only surviving male, he watched his widowed mother struggle to manage the household; moreover, when she died, he built his first *jingshe*, or 'lodge of wondrous remembrance,'[46] to meditate and study near her gravesite. Just how profoundly he believed in the grave site geomancy, which perhaps included *yingong* or geomantic grave *qigong*, is evident not only in his exhuming and reburying his father but also in delaying the burial of his son for a year in 1191 on the advice of an expert in geomancy.[47] Taking such matters about grave sites and rites into account, the

45 Zhu Xi, *Zhu Wengong wenji* (*Sibu congkan* edition), 15:34a-b: tr. Patricia Ebrey, *Confucianism and Family Rituals in Imperial China: A Social History of Writing about Rites* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 139.

46 Phrase coined by Lionel M. Jensen, "Popular Cults and Confucian Paideia in Medieval China," 1988 paper for the Symposium, Religion and Society in China, 750-1300, held at the University of Illinois.

47 *Zhu Wengong wenji*, *xuji* 7.8b; cited in Ebrey, 138-39 and Wing-tsit Chan, *New Studies*, 119-120. But Professor Chan said this decision was certainly a concession to his son's wife. Professor Chan's evidence is problematic: he quotes a letter from Zhang Shi inquiring about a burial, but Zhang died eleven years before Zhu's son, so he was not inquiring about the burial in question.

reader might well concur with Professor Patricia Ebrey's surmise: "One cannot say that his larger interest in cosmology led him to his interest in geomancy; it is just as possible that his emotional attachment to the significance of graves and their location, nurtured by his early experiences, made him receptive to geomantic theories, and from these theories to even more comprehensive cosmological schemes."[48] A similar pattern will become evident in other points of my inquiry; there will be further evidence presented that Zhu Xi's concern for spirits and ritual practices were more primary than his philosophical system about such matters.

Second, Zhu Xi's concern to accommodate contemporary customs and ritual practices led him to endorse a major departure from canonical grave site rituals--even over Zhang Shi's objections. In response to Zhu Xi's draft of the *Family Rituals* (*Jiali*), Zhang Shi underlined the point that Zhu Xi was going against classical guidelines:

> The ancients did not sacrifice at graves. This was not an omission; they knew that the feelings and forms of ghosts and spirits could not receive sacrifices at graves. The spirit tablets are in shrines, and the grave contains the bodily soul (*ti po*). How can sacrificing at the place that contains the bodily soul accord with moral principle? Who receives the sacrifice? Those who insist on practicing this (gravesite sacrifice) because of private feelings, even though they recognize that logically it does not work, are serving their ancestors hypocritically.[49]

---

48 Ebrey, *Confucianism and Family Rituals*, 142.

49 Zhang Shi, *Nanxuan ji* (Siku quanshu edition), 20.2b-3b; tr. Ebrey, *Confucianism and Family Rituals*, 127.

Justifying his and the Cheng brothers' departure from classical canons for rites, Zhu Xi replied:

> ... so the current feeling is that on these days one cannot help thinking of one's ancestors and also offering them the item. Although it is not an orthodox ritual, it is something that, given human feelings, cannot be omitted.[50]

Thus, this was a case adapting classical cannons on the basis of practical considerations, the feelings of contemporary people, and concern for ancestral spirits.

Third, whereas Zhang Shi objected to rites for 'calling down the spirits' because this part of the capping ceremony (marking a boy's coming of age) would encourage ignorant people to believe in ghosts, Zhu Xi approved of calling down the ancestral spirits.[51] Several passages in the *Yulei* record Zhu Xi's responses to Zhang Shi's more skeptical attitude toward spirits.[52] Similarly, in his shrines, Zhu Xi led his students in invoking the spirits of the sages. For a 1194 ceremony addressed to the spirits of Confucius (Kongzi) and others, Zhu Xi wrote: "Presenting our offerings and praying respectfully, trust that the spirits, descending to this place, will draw nigh, communicate and bless with illumination (*guangming*)."[53]

Fourth, Zhu Xi asked: "If we say that nothing comes to accept the

50 *Zhu Wengong wenji*, 30.29a-30a; tr. Ebrey, *Confucianism and Family Rituals*, 128.

51 See discussion in Ebrey, 131-132.

52 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.34, 35, 37-39, and 63.1550.

53 *Zhuzi daquan*, 86.12b.

sacrificial offerings, why sacrifice?"[54] This rhetorical question suggests that Zhu Xi was not completely satisfied with the classical Confucian injunction (e.g., *Analects*, 3/12) to sacrifice to the spirits merely as if they were present. He discussed questions regarding *guishen* and ancestral sacrifices in so many *Yulei* passages that Professor Yung Sik Kim concluded: "there could hardly be anything more important than the sacrificial service for him."[55] Still, in line with the traditional Confucian idea that the crucial consideration was the impact of the sacrificial rites on those performing the rites, Zhu Xi insisted that the mind of the descendant be sincere (*cheng*) and reverent (*jing*) so that contact could be made with the ancestor's dispersed *qi* and call them back to respond to the sacrificial offerings: "If one exhausts one's sincerity and reverence in the rites of sacrificial offerings, one can reach the *guishen* of the ancestors."[56] Zhu Xi also said: "If this sincere mind reaches and moves, how can the other's [i.e., the ancestor's] *qi*, which is not completely exhausted or dispersed, not come to receive the food offering? "[57] The emphasis in such passages on being sincere and reverent should not, however, obscure the fact that Zhu Xi encouraged the expectation that sacrificial offerings presented with utmost sincerity would indeed evoke a positive response from the ancestor's spirit.

Fifth, there is considerable evidence of Zhu Xi and his students wrestling with justification for offering sacrifices to those who did not belong to one's patrilineal line of *qi*. Because of Zhu Xi's insistence upon the particularly shared *qi* passed down the patrilineal line, it is not surprising that

---

54 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.51; tr. Gardner, "Ghosts," 607.

55 Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 95.

56 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.46; see also 63.1551-52.

57 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.38; translation adapted from Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 95.

one of his students raised the question of how to justify participation in sacrificial services either to one's wife or her ancestors. Since one had not inherited that particular *qi* and 'mental spirit' (*jingshen*), how could one reach one's wife's ancestors? The student even proposed a solution that would sidestep the apparent contradiction with Zhu Xi's requirement of directly related *qi*. The student suggested that instead of a case of *qi*, such contact was based on the sincerity in one's *xin*. However, rejecting this easy resolution, Zhu Xi evoked the philosophical principle of the original oneness or universality of *qi* to justify customary practice of joining in sacrificial services to one's deceased wife and her ancestor:

> But that to which sacrifice is made is their *jingshen*, *hun* and *po*, and none of these are not penetrated. It's probably because [their *qi*] originally flowed out from one source, and in the beginning there were no separate divisions; this is also the same even for the *guishen* of heaven and earth, mountains and rivers.[58]

Such a glaring exception to Zhu Xi's insistence upon particular *qi* linking descendants and ancestors at the sacrificial service provides another example of the primacy of practical considerations over abstract principles. Nonetheless, despite the importance of justifying participation in services for one's wife's ancestors, the universality of one *qi* would seemingly undermine Zhu Xi's grounds for objecting to Buddhist and Daoist sacrificial services for those outside of one's own lineage. The passage above also drew a parallel

58 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.50 I am grateful for Professor Kim for drawing my attention to this passage that would apparently decrease Zhu's emphasis on particular ancestral *qi*. See also his *Natural Philosophy*, 95-96.

between services for a wife's ancestors and sacrifices to the spirits of heaven, earth, mountains and rivers. Indeed, he went so far as to say that one could reach rain spirits and Buddhist deities because they occupied particularly numinous *qi* sites in mountains and along rivers:

> Like praying for rain, one also acts on them [i.e., the spirits in charge of rain] with one's sincerity. Similarly in praying to spirits and buddhas, it is also that the *qi* of the mountains and rivers where they reside can be acted upon. The places where spirits and buddhas now reside are all the triumphant and numinous points of the rivers and mountains.[59]

In other words, Zhu Xi apparently conceded that one could reach the buddhas because of the numinous *qi* of the mountains and rivers where their shrines were located.

The parallels above that Zhu Xi drew to sacrifices to spirits of heaven, earth, mountains and rivers prompts us to explore briefly Zhu Xi's statements about such spirits. Sacrifice to these spirits was similar to prayers Zhu Xi made to the spirits for rain: as with sacrificial prayers to ancestor's spirits, one sought a response, so all of these spirits are related to Zhu Xi's third category of *guishen*. He believed that when such spirits were joyous, they responded favorably to prayers and sacrificial offerings. For instance, in explaining the claim in the *Mencius* (5A/5) that the numerous spirits joyfully received Yao's sacrificial service, Zhu Xi likened this case to "praying for clear weather producing clear weather, and praying for rain

59 *Zhuzi yulei*, 90.2292; adapted tr. Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 97.

producing rain."[60] Some of Zhu Xi's invocations to the spirits of the land and prayers for rain have been preserved in his collected writings.[61] Unlike some officials, Zhu Xi expressed no reluctance or skepticism about performing these ritual prayers for rain; moreover, he claimed that he expended all of his sincerity when he prayed for rain.[62] Of course, prayers for rain were part of his duties as a local official. Rather than minimizing the relevance of these prayers, Zhu Xi's official status while making the prayers is particularly germane to our inquiry.

One's status and relationship to the spirits of the natural world was a crucial consideration to Zhu Xi, for there were rules about who could rightfully offer sacrifices to great natural objects and phenomena. Referring to classical dicta, Zhu Xi said:

> The Son of Heaven offers sacrifices to Heaven and Earth; the heads of the various states offer sacrifices to mountains and rivers; and high officials offer sacrifices to the five domestic spirits." All these are [examples of the case of] one's mental spirit appropriately reaching them [i.e., the spirits to whom one offers sacrifices] and thus being able to stimulate and call them to come. If the heads of the various states offer sacrifices to Heaven and Earth, or if high officials offer sacrifices to mountains and rivers, then it is meaningless.[63]

---

60 *Zhuzi yulei*, 58.1360; tr. Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 96.

61 *Zhuzi daquan*, 85.21a, 86.9a, 16ab.

62 See his letter to Chen Liang in *Zhuzi daquan*, 36.17a; tr. in Tillman, *Utilitarian Confucianism*, 118.

63 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.47; adapted translation by Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 97.

Hence, one's ability to reach such spirits depended upon one's relationship to them, a relationship that was grounded in one's official status.

Zhu Xi even discussed these classical rules relating official status and sacrifices in terms of the issue the inappropriateness of offering sacrifices to non-ancestors.

> *Guishen* are essentially existent entities. Ancestors are also only of one *qi* with these [descendants here], and there is an inclusive or whole set [of the family]. When the descendants are physically present here, the ancestor's *qi* is also here, and they have a penetrating consanguinity (*xiemai*). Therefore, the reason "spirits do not enjoy the offerings of those not their kindred and people do not sacrifice to those not their ancestry" is simply that their *qi* is not related. In the case of "the Son of Heaven offers sacrifices to Heaven and Earth; the heads of the various states offer sacrifices to mountains and rivers; and high officials offer sacrifices to the five domestic spirits"--even though these are not one's patrilineal ancestors--the Son of Heaven is the hosting lord (*zhu*)of Heaven and Earth, and the heads of the various states are the lords of the mountains and rivers, and the high officials are the lords of the five domestic sacrifices. When one's hosting reaches the other [i.e., the spirits of the ancestors], then their *qi* also all aggregates summarily on one's own body; when it happens like this, there is a locus of interaction.[64]

---

64 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.47.

This difficult passage was important enough to be recorded in the same wording by two different students. Herein, Zhu Xi suggested that the hosting lordship inherent in official status provided a parallel to the consanguity between descendants and ancestors because there was a bond of lordship or belonging when the appropriate person made the sacrificial offerings. The word *zhu* (host or lord) in the above passage can be better understood by reading a similar passage in which a different character is used. This character *shu* means 'to belong to' or 'to be connected with' or 'to depend upon;' moreover, it has an alternative pronunciation of *zhu* meaning 'to be connected with' or 'to be near to' or 'to entrust to.' Commenting on *Analects* 3/6, where Confucius sternly objected to the Ji family offering a sacrifice to Mt. Tai because the Ji family was not the lord of the Lu state, Zhu Xi remarked:

> "The Son of Heaven offering sacrifices to heaven and earth and the heads of the various states offering sacrifices to the mountains and rivers in their states" is precisely connected to this [principle that the] 'Others' [i.e., the spirits] belong to oneself, and so one's sacrifices reaches them. If they do not belong to oneself, the *qi* does not mutually stimulate (*xianggan*), so how can one reach them through sacrifices ?[65]

In both of these quoted passages, Zhu Xi made a case that the spirits of the 'other' (*ta*) really belonged or were connected to the 'one' (*wu*, literally 'I' or 'me') offering the sacrifice to the 'other.'

---

65 *Zhuzi yulei*, 25.612 (8b); tr. adapted from Kim, *Natural Philosophy*, 97.

In another related passage, Zhu Xi explored a different aspect of the classical dicta (about spirits not enjoying the offerings of those not their kindred) when he gave examples of cases when the *qi* was related--despite the absence of blood relationship. He again cited the example of the emperor appropriately offering sacrifices to Heaven--and Heaven responding--because 'there was a *qi* category (*qilei*)' shared between them. [The shared *qilei* seems similar to the blood relationship or consanguinity (*xiemai*) discussed above.] Then after again mentioning the example of the heads of the various states offering their sacrifices, Zhu Xi added: "Now, offering sacrifices to Confucius must be with learning (*xue*); his *qi* category can thus be contemplated."[66] This passage is particularly noteworthy because it juxtaposed the emperor offering sacrifices to Heaven and people offering sacrifices to Confucius; moreover, the basis for both kinds of sacrifices was a shared *qi* category between the spirits there and the one here making the sacrifices and offerings. As will be explored soon, Confucius represented a special case to Zhu Xi that requires further discussion. My fifth point here, in short, is: Zhu Xi found ways of justifying customary sacrifices for those outside of one's lineage; however, he generally did so in ways that imposed rules regarding who could offer sacrifices, and he projected a connecting bond of 'belonging' and shared *qi* between those making and receiving proper sacrificial offerings.

Sixth, in sacrificial rites to the sages, Zhu Xi's statements provide evidence of treating sages as imagined ancestors. For instance, he repeatedly addressed the sages in the language of a prayerful report (*gao*).[67] This genre

66 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.52.

67 See, for instance, the various writings in *Zhuzi daquan*, 86.

was comparable to reports (*bao*) to one's biological ancestors during family worship. Responding to one question about offering sacrifices to sages and worthies, he replied that since the sages and worthies "gave meritorious achievements to the people, the people should naturally *bao* (i.e., report to, or recompense) them; this is just like the ancients offering sacrifices to the Five Emperors."[68] [The Five Emperors (*wu di*) were legendary heroes who made major contributions to the beginnings of civilization.] In other words, one was thanking and repaying both the sages and the ancestral spirits--as distinct from making request to or beseeching (*qi*) deities for specific favors or blessings.[69]

The structure and place for reporting to the sages reinforced metaphorical identity between sages and ancestors. Besides arranging spirit tablets at academies and study retreats to mirror the generational order in a lineage's ancestral hall, Zhu Xi set a daily schedule for his students to offer obeisance in the ancestral image hall (*yingtang*), at the shrine of the earth god, and before the portraits of the sages.

According to his student's account,

> Master [Zhu] arose early every morning and would emerge from his chamber after all the students attending the academy had dressed, rung the bell, and gone to the image hall to await him. After they opened the door, the Master ascended the hall, and led the students, in their proper ranks, in paying obeisance and lighting incense. He paid obeisance again and withdrew. One of the

68 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.53.

69 On this distinction, see the quotations discussed in Neskar, 160.

> students would be sent to burn incense and pay reverence to the earth god's shrine. Afterwards, accompanying our Master and ascending into the chamber, we would pay reverence to the Former Sage/Former Teacher and then sit in the academy's study hall.[70]

Given that this passage is ascribed to Wang Guo who recorded sayings at the Zhulin Study Lodge after 1194,[71] this must describe activity at that lodge in Fujian, where Zhu Xi is not known to have had any relatives beyond his own immediate family. Yet, the 'students' are referred to in familial terms of *zidi*, 'sons and younger brothers,' rather than as *dizi*, 'disciples' or 'students'; thus, the use of the term *zidi* would lead one to assume a lineage school instead of a study lodge for non-relatives. This further complicates the fact that the *zidi* first convened in the *yingtang*, a hall generally reserved for ancestral images, and only afterwards went to another chamber to pay their respects before the spirit tablet of Confucius and the sages. It is striking that the same term *zidi* is used to describe the participants in the whole series of activities. Of course, it is possible that Wang Guo simply misappropriated partrilineal terms to describe activities of the study retreat's members because he regarded them as 'family.' It seems strange that Zhu Xi would be leading non-lineage students to pay reverence to the image portraits of his own lineage. According to Professor Ebrey's research, Zhu Xi disapproved of using portraits in ancestor worship and did not use the term '*yingtang*' (image halls).[72] However, as Professor Neskar has observed, Zhu Xi did approve of

70 *Zhuzi yulei*, 107.2674; compare translation by Neskar, 196.

71 Chen Rongjie (Wing-tsit Chan), *Zhuzi menren* (Taibei: Xuesheng shuju, 1982), 63.

72 Patricia Ebrey, "Education Through Ritual: Efforts to Formulate Family Rituals During the Sung Period," in Wm. Theodore de Bary and John W. Chaffee, eds., *Neo-*

using portraits of sages and worthies.[73] (Interestingly, in one recorded conversation with his students, Zhu Xi rejected having a large statue of Confucius at the Yuelu Academy, but did express flexibility about having a smaller statue of Confucius in a seated posture.[74]) Thus, despite Wang Guo's strange diction here, it is thus quite likely that the portraits in the image hall belonged to ancient sages and recent worthies. In any event, this passage treats 'students' as 'sons and younger brothers,' thus blurring the distinction between disciples and patrilineal relatives. Furthermore, leading students in daily services before the sages' spirit tablets or portraits seems somewhat analogous to one's daily reporting to, and paying respects to, one's ancestral parents. It is also noteworthy that the morning rituals culminated in Zhu Xi leading the students in paying reverence to the Former Sage/Former Teacher, i.e., Confucius.

Seventh, Confucius appears to have occupied a special place in Zhu Xi's rituals, and he even made confessional prayers to Confucius that further suggest a kind of fictive familial ties. On one occasion, Zhu Xi became so exasperated with his inability to control a student's behavior that he addressed Confucius's spirit:

> I, Xi, am unworthy. I have recently been recommended and appointed as an official in charge of this county, so I obtained responsibility to co-direct school affairs here. There is a certain student under my direction whose bad behavior has stained those in

(續)

Confucian Education: The Formative Stage (Berkeley: University of California Press), 301.

73 *Zhuzi daquan*, 77.14ab, 79.2b, 11a; Neskar, 29-31.

74 *Zhuzi yulei*, 3.52.

> charge. I believe that since I have failed to carry out the *dao* myself, I have been unable to lead and hone others and have allowed [matters] to come to this. Moreover, as I was unable [to impose] proper penalties early on to punish and control him. As a result both virtue and rules were lax, and disobedient literati ultimately had no restrictions. Therefore, I am reporting to the Former Sage/Former Teacher to request direction in rectifying school rules and in using the punishment of publicly labeling (*ming xing*) to cause the students to feel ashamed. [According to the classics,] "a wooden ruler is to instruct and punish," and "the two sticks can be effective in bestowing awe." All these are models that the Former Sage/Former Teacher bequeathed to later generations for administrating schools. The Former Sage/Former Teacher is approaching from above; how dare I, Xi, not put my palms on the ground and kowtow (*qishou*).[75]

The *ming xing* was a punishment in which offenders had to remove their caps and trappings of status and wear on their backs a placard or poster announcing their offense. It is also noteworthy that Zhu Xi cryptically referred to the 'Shun Dian' chapter of the *Book of Documents* and the 'Xueji' chapter of the *Book of Rites* as providing a model for inflicting punishment by using a stick to strike (the hands of) the students.[76] Despite his interest

---

75 *Zhuzi ji*, 86.4423; compare translation by Neskar, 199; Professor Neskar translates part of this passage, leaving out the model of punishment, and reading the *ming xing* without linking it to a mode of punishment; thus, she interprets the passage as purely an admonition for Zhu's own self-cultivation.

76 *Book of Documents*, see James Legge, tr. *The Chinese Classics*, 3: 38-39; and Cai Shen, *Shujiing jizhuan*, p. 7, in volume 1 of *Sishu wujing : Song Yuan zhu* (Beijing:

in threatening to punish the students, Zhu Xi was obviously also asking for guidance in furthering his own self-cultivation. Furthermore, he might have been expressing his shame in order to shame his students, too, for he wanted the students to be ashamed and thus refrain from improper behavior. This sounds to me like a routine ploy of Chinese parents in criticizing themselves for the mistakes of their children in order to evoke shame and reform in the children. More importantly, what is of particular interest to us here is how Zhu Xi positioned himself as mediator between his students and Confucius' spirit. By assuming both the parental role toward the student and a descendant's role in reporting his own shortcomings, Zhu Xi could be seen here as evoking a sense of communal family ties and enhancing his own unique status.

In his confessional pleas to the spirit of Confucius, Zhu Xi would also express his anxiety over repeating previous mistakes while serving in office. Specifically, when assuming his duties in Nankang in 1179, he wrote a prayer to Confucius to report his record of government service and request direction. Recounting how the pressures of his last term of government service had resulted in illness forcing his retreat, he told of his efforts during his years of retirement to improve himself. Despite his efforts to decline further service, he had been prevailed upon to undertake the present duties at Nankang, but he feared being so incompetent as to bring disrepute to his ruler and teachers. Thereupon, he continued:

As I begin my service here, I summon my courage to sincerely and

(續)

Zhongguo shudian, 1985, photo-reproduction of the Shijie shuju edition). See also the *Xueji* chapter of the *Liji* in Wang Mengou, *Liji jin zhu jin yi* (Taibei: Commercial Press, 1971), 2: 479.

> prayerfully report, requesting the spirit of the Former Sage/Former Teacher to direct my mind. Enable me to avoid becoming an offense to these people and to retire to my fields expeditiously without ending up as I did on my last tour of duty. Then I, Xi, will have unrestrained joy, so I'm respectfully beseeching.[77]

Here again, he is beseeching Confucius' spirit for guidance.

Eighth, beyond conveying an intimation of kinship, Zhu Xi on occasion specifically used the term *zong* (descent lines), a term that suggested direct patrilineal descent from the sages. It is noteworthy that even though Zhu Xi did not discuss the *zong* issue in 1176, he incorporated it during the 1180s to become a major theme in his *Family Rituals*.[78] The timing is significant, for it was also during the 1180s that he developed the rubric of the *daotong* in his assertion as the authoritative reader of the tradition. The blending of the *zong* system and the claim to the *daotong* is clearly pronounced in his 1189 preface to the *Doctrine of the Mean* (*Zhongyong*). To answer his own question of how the *Mean* had come to be written, Zhu Xi asserted that Confucius' disciples Yan Hui and Zengzi provided the link to the *zong* of the ancient sages, and Zengzi then passed the transmission on to Confucius's grandson, Zi Si, who completed the work. Thereupon the transmission of the *daotong* flowed.[79]

In 1194, Zhu Xi provided an enshrinement version of his *daotong* that

---

77 *Zhuzi daquan*, 86.3b.

78 See discussion in Ebrey, *Family Rituals*, 134-35. See also Kai-wing Chow, *The Rise of Confucian Ritualism in Late Imperial China: Ethics, Classics, and Lineage Discourse* (Stanford : Stanford University Press, 1994), especially 100, 113-14.

79 *Zhuziji*, 76.3994.

again turned on family imagery of *chuan* 'passing down (inheritance)' and *zong* 'descent lines.' (It is perhaps significant that this service was done at the same Zhulin Study Lodge, here called the Cangzhou Study Lodge, whose schedule of daily services Wang Guo described in one of the quotations discussed above.)

> I, the later student, Zhu Xi, venture to prayerfully entreat the Former and Ultimate Sage, the King of Promoting Culture [Confucius]. Let us celebrate the *dao* legacy [extending] back to Fu Xi and the Yellow Emperor. Its achievements were all assembled by the Original Sage [Confucius], who transmitted the ancient [teachings], gave instructions, and set standards for ten thousand generations His three thousand disciples were transformed as if [his instructions] had been a timely rain. Only Yan Hui and Zengzi were able to get the legacy of Confucius. It was not until Zi Si and Yu that his legacy was made more lustrous and great. Since then, subsequent followers lost the true transmission in the process of teaching and receiving. The legacy was not continued until more than one thousand years later. What Zhou [Dunyi] and the Cheng brothers learned and taught was that the myriad principles (*li*) had one single origin. As for Shao [Yong], Zhang [Zai], and Sima [Guang], even though their learning was diverse, they all arrived at the same conclusions about the *dao*. They facilitated us later generations, as if we were moving from a dark night into the dawning of a new day. When I, Xi, was a child, I received instruction from [my late father] because of my limitations. In my youth, I was taught by standard teachers, and in my mature years, I

> have met those who had the *dao*. Gazing upward respectfully, and even though nothing is heard, [I know that] due to the spirit of Heaven, we are fortunate that nothing [being passed down] has been lost. Now, I am old and retired [from government service], and those who are fond of the same things have gathered here, and we have built this study lodge. At the beginning of our living together, [I] look for the origins and deduce the roots [of our *dao*] because [I] do not dare obscure [our] minds. Presenting our offerings and praying respectfully, [we] trust that the spirits, descending to this place, will draw nigh, communicate and bless with illumination. [We] will then faithfully and untiringly--without rejecting anything--transmit it [the *dao*] without interruption to those coming in the future. Now, as this is an auspicious day, I will lead the assembled students in celebration, performing the rite of offering food to the spirits [of the sages and teachers named]. Please receive the offerings![80]

It is particularly noteworthy that his insistence upon the importance of the *zong* in ancestral rites was matched by his identification of a *zong* within those installed in transmission shrines. Zhu Xi's philosophy of *qi* dictated the necessity of continuity of the same *qi* between the ancestor and the proper descendant performing sacrificial rites; moreover, the exceptions, which he did allow, were governed by strict rules of status and 'belonging' that were functionally equivalent to consanguinity, Since he portrayed the spirits as

---

80 *Zhuzi daquan*, 86.12ab, or *Zhuzi ji*, 86.4446. I have used some of Jensen's translation (in "Ruins of Remembrance") of parts of this inscription, but my translation also differs.

coming down from Heaven in response to his sacrificial offerings and ensuring that nothing was lost in his inheritance of the *dao*, Zhu Xi obviously felt he had met his own expressed qualifications for being the proper person qualified to contact the spirit of Confucius and other sages and worthies.

But how could Zhu's critics in the 1190s fail to condemn Zhu Xi's claims to a unique relationship with Confucius' spirit? Surely such a radical claim would have made him more culpable in the eyes of his enemies at the emperor's court than their official allegations, such as the charge that he had had sex with two Buddhist nuns.[81] Those charges were strong enough to label him a teacher of bogus learning; moreover, when Zhu Xi died in 1200, his teachings were still officially banned. We should remember that his claim to special access to the spirit of Confucius was initially articulated only within the fellowship at the shrines heard only by his disciples, and remained unpublished until after he was enshrined in the Confucian Temple in 1241--thus after his claim would no longer seem so radical. Perhaps it is a measure of how much later generations down to the present have taken Zhu Xi's privileged status for granted that we have generally overlooked how brash he must have been when he first articulated his claim to special access to the spirit of Confucius.

Ⅲ. Conclusion

The present study has queried apparent tensions within some of Zhu Xi's statements about *guishen*. On the one hand, he reinforced classical pronouncements against offering sacrifices to other people's ancestors by

81 Ye Shaoweng, *Sichao wenjian lu* (Beijing : Zhonghua shuju, 1989), pp. 143-46.

elaborating on the necessity of the particular *qi* that descendants inherited from ancestors. On the other hand, when asked to justify participation in sacrificial services for one's deceased wife or her ancestors, he called upon the universality or ultimate oneness of all *qi* as the grounds for effectually reaching and moving these spirits. This statement, citing the oneness of all *qi*, might encourage us to conclude that his endorsement of sacrifices to the sages meant that he was opening up the tradition in such a way as to provide access philosophically for everyone to the sages. Indeed, his boldness in setting up shrines and offering sacrifices to sages and worthies--particularly Confucius--was a challenge to the state-controlled cult of Confucius centered in the Temple of Confucius. China's political division into competing dynastic governments certainly enhanced Zhu Xi's freedom to claim (at least privately within his group's shrines and academies) access to Confucius directly and outside of the state's guidelines for rituals in the Temple of Confucius. Nevertheless, a closer reading of Zhu Xi's statements has shown that he had rules about offering sacrifices to the spirits of non-relatives. He drew a parallel between the case of sacrificial offerings to one's wife's ancestors and sacrifices to Heaven and Earth, mountains and rivers. Furthermore, he endorsed classical dicta that only the emperor could offer sacrifices to Heaven and Earth, and only the heads of the various states could offer sacrifices to the mountains and rivers in their areas. Likewise, local officials were empowered to make offerings to local spirits and pray for rain. Thus, official status in the governmental system was an apparent requirement. In justifying this exclusivity, Zhu Xi claimed that there was a special lordship operative in such cases. For example, since the emperor was the ruler in relation to Heaven and Earth, these spirits 'belonged to' or were 'connected to' him, so they would respond to his offerings and prayers. Zhu

Xi further argued that such connection was based on sharing the same 'category' (*lei*) of *qi*; thus, the *qi* category was analogous to the consanguinity of the *qi* shared by patrilinial relatives. Juxtaposing sacrificial offerings that the emperor made to Heaven and people's sacrifices to Confucius, Zhu Xi even stated that one's approach to Confucius' spirit must be based on 'learning' (*xue*); therein, one could contemplate what the *qi* category of Confucius' spirit was.

Since one's access to Confucius' spirit was determined by one's learning, Zhu Xi's stance again, at first brush, appears very egalitarian, at least among the literati elite; however, closer scrutiny of his statements and ritual actions has found him making metaphorical identity between sages and ancestors in ways to enhance only his own unique standing. He daily led his students in paying respect to the sages in settings and forms that mirrored lineage rites for ancestors; hence, his status was not only the teaching Master but also the *zong* head of the imagined descent group. In his 1194 service at the Cangzhou Study Lodge, he actively drew upon this language imagery of *zong* descent line and *chuan* inheritance to project the transmission of the *dao* from the sages down to himself. Moreover, on occasions, he made confessional prayers to Confucius and beseeched Confucius' spirit for guidance and illumination. In one such instance, confessing his shortcomings and asking for guidelines on how to punish and discipline erring junior members of the group, Zhu Xi acted as mediator between Confucius' spirit and his students.

By respectfully presenting sacrificial offerings to Confucius. Zhu Xi was, in part, following the tradition of honoring teachers and especially the ancient Sage as the archetype teacher. Yet, in his prayers and confessions to Confucius' spirit, Zhu Xi appears also to be addressing Confucius as an

ancestor. His prayers and confessions were, after all, not in the form of petitions (*qi*) for blessings from deities, but rather of reports (*gao*)--similar to the reports (*bao*) one would make to the spirit tablets of one's ancestors. Having at 14 *sui* lost his father and spending his entire life with only rare contact with the patrilineal relatives that normally played a major role in a person's maturation and career, Zhu Xi was also more sensitive than some of his close colleagues (such as Zhang Shi) to rites calling down the spirits, performing sacrificial rites at graves, and engaging grave site geomancy to ensure the comfort of the spirit and the wholeness of the corpse. His own efforts to follow the instructions from geomancy masters about grave sites, especially when his philosophical penchant pointed in a more purely rationalistic direction, suggest a particularly strong filial need for remembrance and reassurance. His focus on Zhou Dunyi as the one to whom Heaven bestowed the revival of Confucius' teachings apparently arose from a need higher than systematic philosophy. Indeed, in terms of texts and ideas, he could more easily turn directly to the Cheng brothers; yet, in shrines and in the *daotong* that was conceived therein, Zhou Dunyi took precedence over the Chengs. Zhou Dunyi's direct mediation with Heaven provided a parallel to Fu Xi and Confucius. Moreover, in his own sacrificial services to the sages, especially Confucius, Zhu Xi asserted that the spirits above in Heaven had ensured that nothing had been lost in the transmission of the *dao* to him.

Given Zhu Xi's statements and experiences communing with the dead, we might well conclude that his reverent sincerity in approaching Confucius' spirit tablet reflected a sense of imagined descent. Zhu Xi's appropriation of Confucius in this way was surely made a little less difficult by China's political division that resulted in the Jurchen patronizing one Kong lineage in the North and the Song promoting a different one in the South. With the

emphasis in Zhu Xi's philosophy of *qi* on the importance of only a proper descendant benefiting from making the sacrificial offerings, he had a special need to perceive himself as the imagined descendant of Confucius, or at least as particularly connected to Confucius' spirit. If he were spiritually a *zong* lineage descendant of Confucius, Zhu Xi had special resonance with the Sage's mind and a particular inheritance. Although Zhu Xi did not explicitly claim to be Confucius' descendant, he did say that only one with proper status and one to whom the spirits 'belonged' enjoyed a kind of consanguinity and thus could effectively make contact with the spirits. The effectual contact with Confucius' spirit was quite clearly portrayed in Zhu Xi's accounts; thus, he succeeded in fulfilling his own rules or requirements for reaching and moving the spirit.

Moreover, since the *qi* category of Confucius' spirit was 'learning,' Zhu Xi's verbal accounts and bodily kowtows before Confucius' arriving spirit authenticated Zhu Xi's status as authoritative reader of the classics. It is not surprising that students who heard and observed their Master praying and kowtowing to the spirit of Confucius were, after Zhu Xi's death, so insistent on his special status in the *daotong*. Witnessing Zhu Xi's empowerment at the transmission shrines certainly facilitated their acceptance of his genealogical claim about the *daotong* and confirmed their belief in the authority of their Master's articulation of the Sage's message. The example of Confucius (*Analects*,7/33) and Mencius (*Mencius*, 2A/2) served as a restraint against explicitly ranking oneself with the sages; nonetheless, having witnessed Zhu Xi's implicit empowerment in the transmission shrines, his disciples were prepared to take the culminating step in proclaiming their Master to be a Sage, too. *Guishen* and *wen* and *dao* were thus ultimately mutually reinforcing and produced the coherence (*li*) of his philosophical

synthesis. Since this is apparently so, we should not overlook *guishen*, as spirits, when we seek to understand how he fashioned his philosophy.

In summary, the present inquiry focused upon rather abstract, even spiritual aspects of Zhu Xi's philosophy; nonetheless, the primacy of his practical concerns was quite evident. Besides justifying ritual family practices, he obviously was mindful of establishing positions competitive to religious beliefs among the people. Ultimately, his statements about spirits and especially his prayers to Confucius' spirit served to enhance his confidence that he had gained the transmission of Confucius' *dao* and that "nothing [being passed down] had been lost." By setting forth these claims orally in the presence of his students and by placing himself as mediator between them and Confucius, Zhu Xi harnessed spiritual power toward his practical, even political, agenda of being the authoritative reader and interpreter of the classics and of the Daoxue fellowship. Since they witnessed his claim that the sagely spirits from Heaven above had ensured that 'nothing was lost' in the transmission of the *dao* to him, their faith in their Master's 'completion' of the tradition was surely enhanced. After all, at the culmination of that sacrificial service, Zhu Xi had led them in pledging to "faithfully and untiringly--without rejecting anything--transmit it [the *dao*] without interruption to those coming in the future." In short, in its own small way, the present inquiry into seemingly abstracted topics of *guishen* and *daotong* provides a further footnote to Professor Yu's thesis about the primacy of practical sociopolitical concerns in Zhu Xi's thinking.

ENDNOTES

A much shorter version of this paper was first given at the 1999 annual meeting of the Association for Asian Studies in Boston. After some revisions, a Chinese version was presented at the international conferences on Zhu Xi in Shanghai (October 2000) and Taipei (November 2000). I summarized this research at an invited lecture at the Institüt für Ostasienkunde-Sinologie at the Ludwig-Maximilians Universität in Munich on February, 5, 2001. Having benefited from questions raised at those venues, I have significantly expanded the discussion for this English version; thus, I owe a debt to various scholars, including (but not limited to) Professors Chen Lai, Yung Sik Kim, Tu Weiming, Hans van Ess, and Thomas Höllmann. Acknowledgements to others, particularly Lionel Jensen, are made in my notes. Moreover, I have reoriented the paper to relate to some of Professor Yu Yingshi's work and presented it at 'China's Future and Past,' a conference to honor Professor Yü Ying-shih's retirement from Princeton University, May 4-5, 2001. My travel to these places was supported variously by the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation (for the Shanghai conference), the Center for Chinese Studies at the National Central Library (for the Taipei conference), and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (for my award trip to Germany).

The Tseng Tien Spirit

David Gedalecia

Michael O. Fisher Professor of History, College of Wooster

Introduction

Among the disciples of Confucius, Tseng Tien 曾點, who was perhaps only a decade or so younger than the Master, is one of the most puzzling. In part, this is because he only makes a brief appearance in the *Analects* and is therefore hard to characterize in depth. But he is also one of the most interesting disciples because of Confucius' surprising support of Tseng's free-spirited approach to living, which is recorded in the Analects in a famous discussion in which Confucius asks four disciples to describe their aims in life.[1] Later thinkers such as Chu Hsi 朱熹 (1130-1200) were hard-pressed to rationalize the Master's endorsement of

1 *Analects*, 11: 25, found in James Legge, tr., *The Chinese Classics* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1960; reprint of 1893 edition), vol. I, pp. 246-249.

Tseng's unconventionality, feeling that it was based on an unguarded, and therefore uncharacteristic reaction to ideas that were reclusive, even Taoist. Others, like Ch'eng Hao 程顥(1032-1085), Lu Hsiang-shan 陸象山(1139-1193), and Wang Yang-ming 王陽明(1472-1529), however, felt that Confucius' reaction was genuine.

Who is correct in the debate over Confucius' reaction to Tseng Tien? Attempting to answer this question involves a reexamination of fundamental Confucian principles and the Neo-Confucian interpretations of these. But in embarking upon this reexamination we must ask why it is important. It is the contention of this essay that to understand the Tseng Tien spirit broadens our understanding of Confucianism itself, precisely because Tseng Tien understood the "inner Confucius," that is to say, the Confucius who is often obscured by a focus on his sober moralism and by the transformation and museumization of his ideas in later centuries. Moreover, in revealing the "inner Confucius," the Tseng Tien spirit that Confucius endorses helps explain how the syncretism between Confucianism and Taoism came about, especially in the ideas of the Neo-Taoists of the post-Han period, and how that syncretism was incorporated into the Neo-Confucian world-view and the Chinese philosophical tradition as a whole.

The Facts on Tseng Tien

As for Tseng Tien himself, we know that his courtesy name was Hsi 晳 and that his personal name, Tien 點, is also written 蒧. His entry in the biographical section on Confucius' disciples in chapter sixty-seven in the *Record of the Historian* (*Shih-chi* 史記) repeats the passage in the *Analects* that records the

exchange with Confucius.[2] We have no exact dates for Tseng, but the traditional dates for his son, Tseng-tzu曾子, who is also known as Tseng Ts'an or Shen參, are 505- *circa* 436 B.C.[3] We know that Tseng Tien was younger than Confucius' more famous disciple Tzu-lu子路(542-480 B.C.) but also that he was among the older generation of disciples, which included Tzu-lu; one theory holds that he was about ten years younger than Confucius, which would place his birth about 541 B.C.[4]

Tseng Tien's son, Tseng-tzu, was one of Confucius' most well-known and most exemplary disciples.[5] In the *Analects*(1:9)[6] and the *Mencius* (4a:19)[7], he is cited as a paragon of filiality, and in the former work(1:4),[8] he is viewed as a model of self-improvement. But in the original sources we have precious little to go on concerning Tseng Tien himself, save that he must have played a major role in shaping Tseng-tzu's sterling character. Ironically, as we shall see, Tseng Tien came to be known for qualities that were never associated with his better-known son.

The Disciples Meet Confucius

As with many other passages in the *Analects*, dating the discussion between

---

2 *Shih-chi*史記(SPPY), 67:11b, 13b. See William Nienhauser, ed., *The Grand Scribe's Records* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), vol. 7, p. 78.

3 In Wing-tsit Chan, ed., *Chu Hsi and Confucianism* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), p. 124 the same dates are given for Tseng Tien.

4 Chu Hsi朱熹, *Lun-yu chi-chu*論語集註 (Taipei, 1958), vol 2, p. 523, in the sub-commentary of Chang Ts'un-chung張存中.

5 Tseng-tzu's son (Tien's grandson) was named Tseng His 曾西, which sometimes creates Confusion in tracing the Tseng family lineage because of the similarity in romanizing the names of grandfather and grandson.

6 Legge, I, p. 141.

7 Legge, II, p. 309

8 Legge, I, p. 139.

Confucius, Tseng Tien and the three other disciples, Tzu-lu (542-480 B.C.), Jan Ch'iu冉求(522-circa 462 B.C.) and Kung-hsi Hua公西華(b. 509 B.C.) is difficult. We know that between about 497 and 484, Confucius left his native state of Lu 魯 and traveled to the states of Wei 衛, Ch'en 陳, and Ts'ai 蔡 (his travel to Ch'u楚is apocryphal). After he left Ch'en for a return visit to Wei, which probably occurred around 489,[9] Confucius apparently longed for the "wild" or "ardent"(*k'uang*狂) students in his home state of Lu.[10] Whether or not he was referring to Tseng Tien as one of these is uncertain; there is no evidence for this in the *Analects*, but later we shall see that Mencius certainly thought so.

Since Confucius was inquiring about the worldly ambitions of his students in the discussion, it is instructive to examine what measure of success they actually had. After the attempted takeover of the government in Lu by Yang Hu (Huo)陽虎(貨)between 505 and 502, the powerful Chi季 clan, under the leadership of Chi Huan-tzu季桓子and his son Chi K'ang-tzu 季康子, actively began to recruit Confucius' disciples. For example, Tzu-lu was serving the Chi clan in 498,[11] before Jan Ch'iu did,[12] and before Tzu-lu

---

9 D.C. Lau, *The Analects* (London: Penguin, 1979), pp. 174-175; cf. Arthur Waley, tr., *The Analects of Confucius* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1938), p. 113 and H.G. Creel, *Confucius and the Chinese Way* (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), pp. 43-44.

10 *Analects*, 5:12 (Legge, I, pp. 244-245). Despite the fact that the word *k'uang* became somewhat legitimized by Neo-Confucians, who often rejected accepted standards and public service, it never lost its association with individuals like Ch'u Yuan屈原(338-277 B.C.), the Neo-Taoist Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove and Li Po李白(699-762), who were characterized by eccentricity and, sometimes, even a touch of madness (see Julia Ching, *To Acquire Wisdom: the Way of Wang Yang-ming* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1976], pp. 26-27).

11 Lau, *The Analects*, p. 247.

12 Creel, pp. 293 and 300; Lau, *The Analects*, p. 208; cf. Legge, I, p. 307. Most likely, Jan Ch'iu succeeded Tzu-lu and did not serve concurrently with him.

left to travel with Confucius a year or so later.[13] In 492, Chi K'ang-tzu assumed control and continued this patronage.

The discussion with the four disciples could have taken place after the fall of Yang Hu in 502 and before 492, when the Confucian group was beginning to be recognized, but there are problems with dating the discussion between 502 and 492. In the year 502, Kung-hsi Hua was only about seven years old and hardly able to talk at length about his worldly ambitions! If we look at a date between 492 and 484, between the time that Chi K'ang-tzu took over and Confucius concluded his travels outside Lu, then Tseng Tien would have been between forty-nine and fifty-seven (assuming a birth date around 541), Tzu-lu between fifty and fifty-eight, Jan Ch'iu between thirty and thirty-eight, and Kung-hsi Hua between seventeen and twenty-five. Kung-hsi would have been a bit young, unless the date for the discussion is closer to Confucius' return to Lu in 484. But if it took place between 492 and 484, then the discussion likely would have taken place during Confucius' travels outside Lu, which would have presented the problem of gathering together this group of disciples. Jan Ch'iu was with Confucius between 492 and 491, as was Tzu-lu, but, as far as we know, neither Kung-hsi Hua nor Tseng Tien accompanied Confucius during his travels. But, some sort of rendezvous might have been possible.

If we speculate that the date is 484 or later, when Confucius was back in Lu, we note that in 484, Jan Ch'iu was already planning the defense of Lu for the Chi clan (which he served until 472)[14] and was fairly well known, as

---

13 *Analects*, 11:23 (Legge, I, pp. 245-246).

14 Ultimately, Jan led his army against the state of Ch'I 齊 and was defeated at the Battle of Lang 郎, though the Ch'i forces eventually withdrew. Watson, Burton, tr., *The Tso chuan: Selections from China's Oldest Narrative History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989), pp. 192-194; Creel, pp. 50-51. See also Waley, p. 20.

was Tzu-lu. Moreover, in 484, upon Confucius' return, Chi K'ang-tzu consulted with Confucius about taxes *via* Jan Ch'iu, and Confucius condemned Jan for enriching the Chi clan through taxation, possibly at this time.[15] In the discussion, Confucius asks the disciples what each would do if more widely known, which suggests that it took place before they were well ensconced in their careers. Moreover, three of the four would have been in their fifties by this time. In this case, the discussion would not have been an inquiry into the ambitions of young disciples looking toward future endeavors, which is the usual interpretation, but rather an assessment of the careers of a mixed-age group based on real-world experience, and, perhaps, a reflection on what they should have done in their careers, by the time Confucius returned to Lu.

If the discussion took place before Confucius' departure, *circa* 500, then Tzu-lu would have been about 42, Jan Ch'iu about 20, and Tseng Tien about 25. At this juncture, none would have served in office. And even though the traditional dating tells us that Kung-hsi would have been 9, this may be incorrect, and certainly the tone of the discussion would suggest this dating.[16] Moreover, if sometime between 492 and 489 Confucius was thinking of Tseng Tien as one of the "wild" Lu students he longed to return to when he was in Ch'en, as Mencius suggests, then he must have been reflecting on earlier contacts with him, possibly in this discussion. Therefore, the encounter might well have occurred before 492, or before Confucius left on his journeys and reflected on students in Lu. This placement in time

15 *Analects*, 11: 16 (Legge, I, pp. 242-243).

16 The dating of disciples is based on the *Shih-chi* 史記 biography of Confucius, which is suspect according to Ts'ui Shu 崔述 (1740-1816); see Creel, p. 64 and Lau, *The Analects*, p. 161.

seems the most likely.

Is dating the discussion important? Since, as we shall see in more detail, Confucius' positive reaction to Tseng Tien seems idiosyncratic, it is interesting to speculate on what stage of Confucius' life it occurred, and, therefore, what the Master's thinking was like and what state of mind he might have been in at the time. If the discussion occurred towards the end of his life, in the 480s, after a particularly disappointing period of wandering about trying to get his message across, his thinking was mature and his mood would likely have reflected a desire to put worldly endeavors in perspective. And if his disciples had already been tested in the worldly arena, then the Master would have expected mature reflection from them. But if, as seems likely, the discussion occurred *before* disappointment set in, and before these diaciples had begun their careers, then we can readily understand why Confucius would have embraced Tseng Tien's attitude, not to endorse a negativism about worldly involvement, but as an affirmation of the necessity to balance responsibilities with an enjoyment of life.

The Discussion in Translation

The following is the complete discussion between Confucius and the four disciples: Tzu-lu (Chung Yu仲由), Tseng Hsi(Tien), Jan Ch'iu(Yu有), and Kung-hsi Hua(Ch'ih赤), in which the Master asks them to express their worldly ambitions if someone were truly to recognize their abilities. Thus, one might assume that none of the three was gainfully employed in government at the time and that Confucius is asking each what he would do if so employed. But, in actuality, Confucius is asking each to state what he would like to accomplish if he were "known," suggesting that they may or

may not have been gainfully employed at the time the discussion took place, but, in any case, implying that no one was especially influential. Here is the discussion[17], followed by the confucius-Tseng Tien "wrap-up":

> Tzu-lu, Tseng Tien, Jan Ch'iu and Kung-hsi Hua were in attendance, and Confucius said: "Try to forget that I'm a day or so your senior. You're always saying: 'No one recognizes my worth.' Now suppose someone did. What would you do?"
> Tzu-lu immediately replied: "Take a medium-sized state hemmed in by larger ones, suffering from invasion, and plagued by drought and famine. Let me take charge and within three years I could rally the people and provide them with a program for the future."
> Confucius smiled faintly.
> "And Ch'iu, what would you do?," Confucius asked.
> He replied: "Imagine, if you will, a state of say sixty or seventy square miles, or even fifty or sixty. I could bring about prosperity in three-years' time. But in the area of ceremonies and music, I would defer to men of true character."
> "And how about you, Ch'ih?," Confucius queried.
> "I'm not saying that I could do it, but I'm eager to learn how. At the ceremonies in the ancestral temple, and at the gatherings of the various royal princes, dressed in the ceremonial cap and gown, I

17 The translation is based on versions found in James Legge, I, pp. 246-249; Arthur Waley, tr., *The Analects of Confucius*, pp. 159-161; Wing-tsit Chan, tr., *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), pp. 37-38; D. C. Lau, *The Analects*, pp. 110-111; and Simon Leys, *The Analects of Confucius* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997), pp. 53-54. Like the discussion, the "wrap-up" is found in *Analects*, 11: 25.

should like to serve as a minor functionary."

"And you, Tien?"

Tien, who had been plucking his lute, paused and while the instrument was still resonating, laid it aside and said:

"My aims differ from what the others have presented."

Confucius said: "What's wrong with that? Each is only speaking his mind here."

Tien continued: "In late spring, after the light garments are ready, I'd like to go for a swim in the River I along with five or six of my buddies and six or seven kids, enjoy the breezes at the Rain Altar together, and then return home singing."

Confucius sighed wistfully and said: "Tien, you're a man after my own heart."

To summarize the ambitions of the disciples, we begin first with Tzu-lu, who wishes to give courage to the people of a state beleaguered by military invasions. Confucius smiles at his response and moves on, his silence cryptic but telling. Jan Ch'iu states that he wishes to increase the population of a small region but defer to abler men in the areas of ritual(*li*禮). Confucius reacts to Jan's statement even less than he does to Tzu-lu's. Next, Kung-hsi Hua says that he wants to be a minor official handling protocol at diplomatic gatherings and ancestral functions, which is a fitting response from a younger, less seasoned individual. Again, Confucius does not react to the description, and he moves on to Tseng Tien, who has been playing his lute all the while the others have been talking. Tseng sets down the instrument, and as the dulcet tones from it fade, he states that his aims differ from those of his compatriots. Confucius encourages him to speak his mind freely, and Tseng

outlines how he would like to take to the water in the River I 沂[18] with friends old and young, enjoy the breeze at the Rain Altar, Wu-I 舞雩,[19] and return home intoning poetry. Unlike the other disciples, he almost brazenly avoids the subject of government service, yet, after listening to Tseng's free-spirited narrative, Confucius sighs and says that Tseng Tien is a man after his own heart: "I'm with you, Tien!" (Wu yu Tien yeh吾與點也).

After Tzu-lu, Jan Ch'iu and Kung-hsi Hua leave, Tseng Tien stays on and asks Confucius what he thought of their responses. Confucius says that they were only expressing their ambitions, but Tseng wants specifics and presses Confucius about his reactions to their ideas. Confucius explains that he smiled at Tzu-lu, the most ambitious of the three, because of his lack of humility; that Jan Ch'iu improperly belittled the idea that a fifty or sixty square-*li* 里 state deserved to be called a "state"; and that Kung-hsi Hua could hardly be deemed a minor official, as he claimed, if he were to serve at diplomatic gatherings and in the ancestral temple, which, for Confucius, were important endeavors.

Significantly, Confucius does not elaborate further on the approval he had given to Tseng, who totally ignored issues of public service. It does seem that Confucius' critical view of the others made him more inclined to support Tseng's free-spirited approach, but was there something more to his approval of Tseng? It could not have been to admonish or correct the others because

18 According to the commentary of Li Tao-yuan酈道元on the *Shui-ching*水經(ch. 25), the I沂 river was outside of the capital of Lu魯and to the southwest, at Ni-ch'iu尼丘 mountain(*Chu-tzu Ssu-shu chi-chu tien-chü-k'ao*朱子四書集註典據考[Taipei, 1976], p. 188); cf. Lau, *The Analects*, p. 244.

19 A place referred to in the *Rituals of Chou* (*Chou-li*周禮) where the prayers for rain were offered and where there were trees under which one could rest (*Chu-tzu Ssu-shu chi-chu tien-chü-k'ao*, pp.188-189).

they're not present for the evaluation he provides Tseng, though, perhaps, his silence after they'd spoken made them wonder if they had said the right thing, or if they had tried too hard to say what they thought Confucius would endorse. Is he merely being polite with Tseng in this "wrap-up?" What we're left with is the fact that Tseng Tien was the only one of the four disciples with whom Confucius agreed, or even whose response invited a reply from the Master, and the only one of the four who remained to continue the discussion. Moreover, even though Confucius did not openly rebuke the other disciples, his support of Tseng in front of them served that purpose. Clearly, Confucius' endorsement of Tseng's unsycophantic response is more than casual.

In a companion piece in the *Analects* (5: 7), Confucius summarizes in the same language we see in the discussion and its aftermath how Tzu-lu, Jan Ch'iu and Kung-hsi Hua define their ambitions but does not mention Tseng Tien in his summary. In this piece, another disciple, Meng Wu Po孟武伯, asks Confucius if any of the disciples possessed humaneness (*jen*仁), to which Confucius replies that he can't say.[20] In this exchange, one would gather that Confucius' uncertainty as to whether or not Tzu-lu, Jan Ch'iu, and Kung-hsi Hua possessed humanity reflects the criticism of them expressed in the aftermath of the discussion. Not criticizing Tseng Tien in the exchange with Meng may be a further, though tacit endorsement of Tseng's unrestrained attitude.

Background on the Disciples

What do we know about Tzu-lu, Jan Yu and Kung-hsi Hua beyond the

20 *Analects*, 5: 7 (Legge, I, p. 175).

exchange with Confucius? Tzu-lu(Yu) lived *circa* 542-480, and his family name was Chung 仲. In his post-discussion "wrap-up" with Tseng Tien, Confucius says that Tzu-lu's inflated sense of importance indicated a lack of humility, and this opinion is supported in the *Analects* (11: 22), where Confucius tries to restrain Tzu-lu's headstrong, extrovert tendencies[21]; obviously, Tzu-lu hardly ever tried to conceal his ambitious side. Elsewhere, he is shown to be kind and generous,[22] courageous but impetuous,[23] and also blunt.[24] Confucius even comments that Tzu-lu showed more courage than judgment[25] and felt that he possessed an unbending demeanor.[26] Perhaps this is why Tzu-lu felt that one should do one's duty but that putting the *tao* 道 (the Confucian moral way) into practice was hopeless.[27] Tzu-lu served the Chi family after Confucius had recommended him, even though Confucius, while appreciating Chi support for his disciples, had some misgivings about the nature of Chi leadership.[28] Confucius believed that despite Tzu-lu's ambitious nature, he would never follow orders that might involve him in patricide or regicide; his moral conscience was beyond reproach. Yet one might conjecture that Tzu-lu represents a case where ambition can go too far.

As for Jan Ch'iu, Confucius tells Tseng Tien after the discussion that Jan Ch'iu was too modest in feeling that the small size of a state diminished its importance, so one is not surprised to find elsewhere in the *Analects* that

---

21 *Analects*, 11: 21 (Legge, I, p. 245); cf. Waley, p. 20.
22 *Analects*, 5: 25 (Legge, I, p. 182).
23 *Analects*, 5: 13 (Legge, I, p. 178).
24 *Analects*, 13: 3 (Legge, I, p. 263).
25 *Analects*, 5: 6 (Legge, I, pp. 174-175).
26 *Analects*, 17: 8 (Legge, I, p. 322).
27 *Analects*, 18: 7 (Legge, I, pp. 335-336).
28 Creel, pp. 33-34.

Confucius urged Jan to be less restrained.[29] D. C. Lau feels that Jan lacked "drive," which fits in with Confucius' belief that Jan was affable (or straightforward)[30]; but Confucius criticizes him for not advising his Chi patrons to attract subjects from afar.[31] Although Confucius believed that Jan was a somewhat ordinary, "garden variety" bureaucrat, he knew that Jan, like Tzu-lu, was an upright individual who would never follow policies leading to patricide or regicide.[32] Nevertheless, as we have mentioned, he eventually denounced Jan Ch'iu for "selling out" by collecting oppressively high taxes on behalf of the Chi family.[33]

As for Kung-hsi Hua's desire to participate in some small aspect of ritual observance, Confucius feels that this endeavor would be more meaningful than Kung-hsi is willing to admit. In other words, Kung-his's modesty led to unjustified self-deprecation. When in the *Analects* Confucius says that he made every effort to learn and teach untiringly, Kung-hsi states that these are qualities that he and the other disciples cannot even begin to emulate, once again expressing his humility.[34] As with Tzu-lu and Jan Ch'iu, Confucius had doubts that he could attribute humaneness to Kung-hsi, even though he feels that Kung-hsi was quite capable of hosting people at court.[35] We learn that Kung-hsi Hua served as an envoy to the state of Ch'i and that Confucius criticized him for enriching those who were already wealthy.[36] In

29 *Analects*, 11: 21 (Legge, I, pp. 244-245).

30 *Analects*, 11: 12 (Legge, I, p. 241); cf. Lau, *The Analects*, p. 107.

31 *Analects*, 6: 6 (Legge, I, p. 187)and 16: 1(Legge, I, pp. 308-309). For more on Jan's employment by the Chi family, see Watson, p. 191.

32 *Analects*, 11: 23 (Legge, I, p. 246).

33 *Analects*, 11: 16 (Legge, I, pp. 242-243); cf. *Mencius*, 4a: 14 (Legge, II, pp. 304-305).

34 *Analects*, 7: 33 (Legge, I, p. 206).

35 *Analects*, 5: 7 (Legge, I, p. 175).

36 *Analects*, 6: 3(Legge, I, pp. 185-186).

other words, with Jan Ch'iu and Kung-hsi Hua we have examples of how retiring attitudes, or lack of enough ambition, can lead to toadying behavior.

The Contrast with Tseng Tien

In order to contrast thoroughly the attitudes of the three disciples discussed above with the attitude of Tseng Tien, we must remember that the discussion in *Analects*, 11:25 is the only place where Tseng Tien appears, and so the contrast with the other three can only be made by interpreting Tseng's cryptic actions and words at this conclave. There are a number of interesting possibilities. But the basic question is: what was Tseng Tien up to?

Tseng Tien might have been deliberately contrasting his aims with the other three because he rejected their political goals and sought non-involvement. But his rejection of their political goals might also indicate that he was trying to transcend the humble attitude of Jan Ch'iu and Kung-hsi Hua and the impetuosity of Tzu-lu, that is to say, the "humility/ambition" trap. In his carefree and relaxed attitude, he was perhaps not refuting worldly involvement generally, but only how these three viewed it. There may even have been personal tensions between Tseng and the others that explain why Tseng played his lute while they spoke and stayed on, trying to get Confucius to reveal why he was so critical of them and not of him.

The way that Tseng seems to parade his off-beat desires so openly is curious. We wonder if he was even listening to the others carefully as he strummed the strings of his lute; did he think that their responses were predictable or too well-tailored to the Confucian formula? Was he trying to relieve himself of the burden of fashioning a political role? It would seem that he was almost inviting rejection and that Confucius' support may have

actually been a surprise to him. Confucius' encouragement of Tseng could have been designed to lift his spirits, a tactical form of support for a less ambitious disciple. But there is another possibility: Confucius and Tseng Tien may have truly been *simpatico*.

We might view Confucius' behavior in the discussion as an example of his despair with worldly politics in the face of rejection of his ideas by the leaders of his time. Therefore, Tseng's views may have struck a responsive chord about withdrawal, or, at least, the attitude that leads one to withdraw from public service. If the discussion took place *circa* 484, Confucius had just gone through about a twelve-year stretch of disappointments during his travels. He might even have been asking his disciples about what one would do if they were "known" because he was in a cynical mood about his own lack of notoriety. And perhaps this led him to side with Tseng, who rejects the more calculating, worldly approach of the others.

But if the discussion occurred at this later time in Confucius' life and in the lives of the disciples, there is another possibility for explaining his response to Tseng Tien. At such a juncture, the disciples, in stating their aims, would have been reflecting on their careers and essentially expressing their shortcomings. In such a scenario, Tseng Tien, seems satisfied with a life well lived: his worldly tasks are behind him and he can enjoy life. Confucius would not only agree with such an assessment. He might even have taken inspiration from it.

Because of his own career frustrations, Confucius often referred approvingly to ancient recluses such as Liu-hsia Hui 柳下惠, Ch'ao Fu 巢父, and Hsu Yu 許由, and also to his own reclusive disciple Ch'i-tiao K'ai 漆雕開(*circa* 540-450 B.C.). But in the discussion under investigation here, he is dealing with a disciple who opts for enjoyment, rather than the travails

associated with holding an official position, but who is not necessarily in a totally reclusive mode.

If the discussion took place *circa* 500, which seems most likely, when Confucius was less disappointed with his own endeavors, the endorsement would have occurred in a positive context. Moreover, Tseng Tien only states what he would like to do, not what he rejects. So if withdrawal from the public arena is not Tseng Tien's intention, his defense of an aesthetic appreciation of life suggests possible connections between the Tseng Tien spirit and a Taoist sensibility that do not necessarily point to eremitism. We shall consider these in greater detail later. But it is interesting to note that no matter when the discussion occurred, and no matter when Tseng's response was advanced, the essential message is that one must find contentment in one's accomplishments.

Mencius Looks at Tseng Tien

One way to address the various interpretations of the discussion is to look at the ideas of Mencius, who expressed an influential opinion about Tseng Tien. In the Mencius, Wan Chang 萬章 asks Mencius about Confucius' experiences with students in the state of Ch'en, *circa* 492-489, which made him long to return to the students in Lu, who were *k'uang*, which literally means "wild" or "mad", but carries related meanings of "unconventional," "undisciplined," "extravagant," "ardent," "high-minded," and "wildly ambitious." [37] Mencius also quotes Confucius' opinion that the students in Lu were also "hasty" but adds that even with their eccentricities,

---

37 See Legge's translations and notes in I, pp. 181 and 272; cf. Lau, *The Analects*, pp. 79 and 122, and his *Mencius*(Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1970), p. 202.

they were "mindful of their origins," which he adds to the passage in the *Analects* that characterizes the students in Lu.[38]

Wan Chang wonders why Confucius had this longing, and Mencius answers, citing the *Analects*, where Confucius says that even though the wild ones rush headlong, one must rely on them if those who follow the middle way are absent. One must choose second best, since the third best are mere squeamish types.[39] Wan Chang then asks Mencius which individuals may be classified as *k'uang*, and Mencius names Ch'in Chang 琴張, Mu P'i 牧皮, and Tseng Tien. When Wan Chang asks why they were so classified, Mencius says that they had lofty goals and professed a love for the ancients but were not terribly scrupulous about their behavior.[40]

Now the passage in the *Analects*(5:21) cited by Wan Chang refers to the problem individuals as "wildly ambitious,"[41] and the passage in the *Analects*(13:21) referred to by Mencius views them as "wild and unconventional" in D. C. Lau's translations.[42] But no matter how one translates *k'uang*, Confucius himself never cites Tseng Tien as an example of one of the students in Lu whom he characterizes in this way. This seems to be Mencius' doing in interpreting Confucius for Wan Chang. Moreover, Mencius does not classify the *k'uang* students in Lu as *completely* unconventional: after all, they don't forget their traditions, even though he admits that they sometimes did not live up to their professed love of the ancients; they were just a bit headstrong, over-enthusiastic.

---

38 *Mencius*, 7b: 37 (Legge, II, pp. 498-499) citing *Analects*, 5: 21 (Legge, I, p. 181).

39 *Analects*, 13:21 (Legge, I, p. 272).

40 *Mencius*, 7b: 37 (Legge, II, pp. 498-499).

41 Lau, *The Analects*, p. 79; cf. Legge, I, p. 181.

42 Lau, *Mencius*, pp. 202-203 (7b: 37).

Let us look further at the use of *k'uang* in the *Analects*. Confucius is said to not understand individuals who are ardent and who "reject discipline" (*Analects*, 8:16),[43] and whose "extravagant conduct" (*Analects*, 17:8)[44] results from "loving firmness without loving learning." In ancient times, the "high-mindedness" (*k'uang*) of such people was exhibited in their disregard or impatience with small things,[45] while with today's *k'uang* types, it results in license, tang蕩(*Analects*, 17:16)[46] or deviation from the moral path.[47] Finally, Confucius says that despite their impatience, unrestraint, ardor, and high-mindedly extravagant behavior, the *k'uang* are at least "enterprising"[48] in seeking out the truth (*Analects*, 13:21). Can any of these characteristics be applied to Tseng Tien? Or are we buying into Mencius' characterization of Tseng Tien as *k'uang* and trying to fit him into a Procrustean mold fashioned according to qualities found in other unnamed individuals in the *Analects*?

The passage in the *Analects* (13:21) cited immediately above about the *k'uang* paints them as "second best" unrestrained spirits. But Confucius does not refer specifically to Tseng Tien in this way, and Tseng's behavior and aims in the discussion with Confucius and the three other disciples do not justify such a characterization. It is Mencius who claims that Confucius was referring to Tseng Tien as a "wild" individual whose conduct was out of bounds.

So here we have a recension on the *Analects* by Mencius that classifies Tseng Tien as undisciplined or even wildly ambitious, and which could be in error. The idea that he was undisciplined, as we shall see, was picked up by

---

43 Legge, I, p. 213; cf. Lau, *The Analects*, p. 94.

44 Legge, I, p. 322.

45 Lau, *The Analects*, p. 146.

46 Legge, I, p. 325.

47 Lau, *The Analects*, p. 146.

48 *Analects*, 13:21(Legge, I, p. 272); Lau, *The Analects*, p. 122.

Chu Hsi in his commentaries on the discussion in his *Classified Conversations* (*Yu-lei*語類), and this is significant. Yet, in terms of what we learn in the discussion, Tseng hardly seems wildly ambitious, especially as compared with Jan Ch'iu and Tzu-lu, who, after all, advanced their careers by serving the Chi clan. And though he was a bit undisciplined, Tseng could not have been completely Bohemian, since he seems to have raised and cultivated Tseng Shen on the straight and narrow[49] and since the Master himself can endorse his carefree appreciation of daily life, knowing full well that Tseng Tien was not merely a Sybarite.

Mencius' evidence in condemning Tseng relies on passages from the *Analects* that really have nothing to do with Tseng. They are critical of the "wild" students in Lu and those who rush ahead willy-nilly, but it is Mencius, not Confucius, who includes Tseng in this group. In fact, at the conclave Tseng seems to be singularly unambitious and laid back, his eccentricity based on enjoying life, rejecting the pursuit of power and influence, and avoiding the temptation to say what was expected. Moreover, Tseng Tien does not appear headstrong after the discussion, when he and Confucius are alone. Would Confucius have been so open with Tseng after the discussion if he thought that Tseng was a wild individual who was out of control? In fact, he seems partial to Tseng precisely because he is not so ambitious as the others, some of whom did try to advance their careers by serving the Chi clan. Moreover, Confucius appreciated Tseng's refreshing candor: he was not

49 Of course, Tseng-tzu's "straight-edge" personality may have been formed in spite of Tseng Tien: in a recent interview, the contemporary actress Winona Ryder contrasted her conservative views with those of her parents, who raised her on a commune and who embraced the American countercultural values of the late 1960s ("The Charlie Rose Show," Public Broadcasting Service [PBS], February 3, 1997 [show # 7021]).

trying to please the Master by telling him what he thought he wanted to hear, which was what the other three did. This may be unconventional, but if it is *k'uang*-like, it certainly also fits in with Confucius' aim to encourage students to think for themselves.

Perhaps Mencius was relying on sources no longer extant for his interpretation of Tseng Tien, but even if he is correct in grouping Tseng with the *k'uang* type in Lu to whom Confucius wished to return *circa* 492-489, it is still possible to interpret Tseng's alleged *k'uang*-ness in a positive light. Tseng Tien's candor and eccentricity reflect the kind of creativity and enthusiasm that teachers, including Mencius, sometimes find endearing in their students.

We should note that in the translations and extensions of the term *k'uang* we have so far considered, one common theme seems to be a carelessness with details on the part of those who may be characterized by it. Lin Yutang, for example, translates it as "brilliant but erratic."[50] Julia Ching translates the term as "mad ardor," referring to Mencius' idea that the *k'uang* "spoke eloquently and extravagantly of the ancients," but seldom lived up to their ideals,[51] possibly because they were distracted by their own enthusiasm. But we have no evidence that Tseng made such pretenses. We can accept the view that he was not a "detail man," and as high-minded, only if we assume that his "carefree spirit" has political implications relating to withdrawal from worldly concerns.

We must remember that Confucius did not characterize Tseng Tien as a wild, ardent, eccentric, extravagant, over-eloquent or high-minded individual. He seems to have been willing to tolerate Tseng's brilliant but erratic

---

50 Lin Yutang, *The Wisdom of Confucius* (New York: Random House, 1938), p. 73.

51 Ching, p. 25.

qualities, and this tells us a lot about Confucius' broad-minded pedagogy. Perhaps, deep down, he harbored an appreciation of eccentricity as a way to achieve an aesthetic balance to life.[52]

Sung Neo-Confucian Interpretations of the Tseng Tien Spirit

Although Chu Hsi was the Neo-Confucian thinker most concerned with the discussion between Confucius and the four disciples, his rival Lu Hsiang-shan may actually have been the first to connect the Tseng Tien spirit with Neo-Confucians of the Northern Sung who preceded him and Chu. In Lu's *Collected Conversations*, he states that:

> After the two Ch'engs (Hao and I) visited Chou Mao-shu (Chou Tun-i), they returned home singing before the full moon, in the spirit of 'I'm with you, Tien.' Later on, Ming-tao(Ch'eng Hao) kept this spirit alive, but I-ch'uan(Ch'eng I) lost it, which moves even ordinary people when I speak about it.[53]

In this passage, the Ch'eng brothers, Ch'eng Hao程顥(Ch'eng Ming-tao程明道；[1032-1085]) and Ch'eng I 程頤(Ch'eng I-ch'uan程伊川；

---

52 The modern jazz saxophonist Charlie Parker was said to have had a keen sense of the surreal that was associated with his creativity; he was known to approach affluent-looking individuals and remark: "a jazz musician, I presume." (Robert Reisner, *Bird: The Legend of Charlie Parker*, [New York: The Citadel Press, 1962], p. 19.)

53 Lu Hsiang-shan 陸象山, *Hsiang-shan hsien-sheng ch'üan-chi* 象山先生全集(*SPTK*), *ts'e* 8, 34: 8b-9a; Chu Hsi朱熹, comp., *I-lo yüan-yüan lu*伊洛淵源錄in *Cheng-i-t'ang ch'üan-shu*正誼堂全書(1868 ed.), *ts'e* 80, 1: 4a.

[1033-1107]) were apparently inspired by the *éminence grise* of the Neo-Confucian school, Chou Tun-i周敦頤(Chou Mao-shu周茂叔；[1017-1073]) so much that they embraced the Tseng Tien spirit in their carefree behavior after visiting Chou. Yet Lu is careful to point out that while Ch'eng Hao maintained the Tseng Tien spirit, Ch'eng I gave up on it. And, of course, Chu Hsi was more partial to the ideas of Ch'eng I.

As for what Ch'eng Hao says, we read:

> Three of the disciples wished to exert control of the state, and so Confucius did not support them. The 'wild' Tseng Tien, though unable to engage in the activities of the sages, was still able to understand Confucius' goals. So he spoke of 'swimming in the River I, enjoying the breeze at the Rain Altar, and returning home singing,' which dealt with those places where one could find happiness. Confucius' goals lay in comforting the aged, being sincere with one's friends, embracing the young, so that the myriad things could all fulfill their natures. Since Tseng Tien knew about these, Confucius heaved a sigh and said: 'I'm with you, Tien!'[54]

Ch'eng Hao believes that Confucius' goal of having all things achieve

---

54 Quoted in Chu Hsi, *Lun-yü chi-chu*論語集註(Taipei, 1958), vol. II, pp. 527-528. The attribution to Ch'eng Hao is found in *Chu-tzu ssu-shu chi-chu tien-chü k'ao*朱子四書集註典據考(Taipei, 1976), p. 189, where it is quoted in part; also see Ch'ien Mu錢穆, 從朱子論語注論程朱孔孟思想歧異["Differences Between the Philosophy of the Ch'eng Brothers and Chu Hsi and that of Confucius and Mencius: A Study of Chu Hsi's Commentary on the *Analects*"], *Ch'ing-hua hsüeh-pao*清華学報, 4(1964), 61.

their proper natures, which is achieved by assisting old and young alike and by dealing sincerely with one's friends, was revealed in the discussion in Tseng Tien's emphasis on camaraderie and enjoyment. Since Tseng Tien's response applied to this wide range of individuals, Confucius agreed with him. Ch'eng Hao also says that both Tseng Tien and Ch'i-tiao K'ai, the reclusive disciple of Confucius, had a grasp of the larger issue, namely, moral principle.[55] Lu's mention of the incident involving the Ch'eng brothers, who were Chu's predecessors, and Chou Tun-i,[56] who was for Chu a pre-eminent thinker, meant that Chu was compelled to examine the central issue under consideration in this article: Confucius' siding with Tseng Tien in the discussion with the four disciples.[57]

According to Chu Hsi, Tseng had a broad comprehension of reality. Chu says that Tseng's statement in the discussion resulted from his perception of "the universal operation of the principle of nature," or *t'ien-li liu-hsing* 天理流行:

> As for Tseng Tien's learning, what he is trying to say is that when human desires are exhausted, the universal operation of the principle of nature extends everywhere without the slightest break. No matter what the circumstances, he was easy-going in this way, so that when

55 Chu Hsi, *Chu-tzu ssu-shu chi-chu tien-chü k'ao*, p. 189; Chu Hsi, *Lun-yü chi-chu*, vol. II, p. 528; Ch'ien Mu, "Differences", p. 61.

56 It is interesting to note that if the Ch'engs embraced the Tseng Tien spirit after meeting with Chou, then it is likely that Chou embraced it too and inspired them to move in that direction.

57 Ch'ien Mu uses the contrasting views of Ch'eng Hao and Chu Hsi on Tseng Tien as the basis for his discussion of the differences in the ideas of the two thinkers in his *Chu-tzu hsin hsüeh-an* 朱子新学案 (Taipei, 1971), pp. 389-434.

> he spoke of his ambitions, he did not go overboard and took pleasure in mundane affairs. From the outset, he did not yield to anyone else's opinions, and his intelligence was far-reaching and in perfect harmony with the universal natural order, fully grasping the subtleties that one can perceive beyond words. Compared with the three [other disciples], who were calculating in their ambitions from beginning to end, his manner was not overbearing. And this was why Confucius sighed and so earnestly agreed with him ...[58]

In this complimentary passage, Chu suggests that Tseng had a profound insight into the inherent rhythmic pattern in nature. Ch'ien Mu says that Chu's emphasis on Tseng's awareness of *li* (principle) was an exaggeration of what Tseng says in the discussion.[59] But Chu's view was probably an elaboration of the view of Ch'eng Hao, who felt that Confucius supported Tseng Tien because he had the sagely insight into reality of a Yao 堯 or Shun 舜.[60]

---

58 *Chu Hsi, Lun-Yü chi-chu*, vol. II, p. 525; Chu Hsi, *Chu-tzu ssu-shu chi-chu tien-chü k'ao*, p. 189; cf. Ch'ien Mu, *Chu-tzu hsin-hsueh-an*, p. 396. Also cf. Chu Hsi, *Chu-tzu yu-lei* 朱子語類 (Taipei, 1970 reprint of 1473 edition), 8: 2b (p. 210; tr. Daniel Gardner, *Learning to be a Sage: Selections from the Conversations of Master Chu*, [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990], p. 101), where Chu states that Tseng had a clear grasp of his ambitions because he understood principle (*li* 理; found also in Chu Hsi, *Chu-tzu wen-chi* 朱子文集, [1532 ed.], 58: 34a, translated in Wing-tsit Chan, *Reflections on Things at Hand: The Neo-Confucian Anthology by Chu Hsi and Lü Tsu-ch'ien* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1967 p. 55]). Also see Ch'ien Mu, "Differences", pp. 60-61. The passage (*circa*1176 A.D.) should also be compared with one in the *Chu-tzu Yü-lei*, p. 1650 (40:10b), where Chu Hsi paraphrases his commentary on the *Analects* but is more critical of Tseng Tien.

59 Ch'ien Mu, "Differences", pp. 61-62.

60 *Ibid*., 61; Chu Hsi, *Lun-Yü chi-chu*, p. 527; attribution to Ch'eng Hao in Chu Hsi, *Chu-tzu ssu-shu chi-chu tien-chü k'ao*, p. 189; cf. Ch'ien Mu, *Chu-tzu hsin-hsüeh-an*, pp. 398 and 404.

Chu's opinion is from his commentary on the *Analects*, written about 1176, when Chu was in his forties (though Chu had written a primer on the *Analects* in 1162[61]). In his later dialogues with disciples, which we shall consider next, Chu qualifies this earlier more favorable view of Tseng Tien.

In a dialogue with his disciple Yang Tao-fu 楊道夫, which took place *circa* 1189, Chu says that Confucius was trying hard to understand Tseng's vague but lofty viewpoint, that is to say, in today's idiom, "where he was coming from."[62] But in another exchange with the disciple Wan Jen-chieh 萬人傑, *circa* 1180, he says that Confucius was caught off guard in responding to Tseng Tien, that his assent occurred because he was made to think quickly, even spontaneously:

> At the time that Tseng Tien spoke of his ambitions, Confucius was merely looking at his explanation spontaneously, which resulted in a snap judgment, and so he agreed with him. The basic details and careful methodology [in Tseng's approach] were mostly lacking, and it was quite similar to Chuang-tzu and Lieh-tzu ...[63]

In other words, Confucius hadn't expected Tseng to express himself in such an apolitical, carefree way as compared with the other three disciples and did not have time to react in a measured way to what Tseng said. Moreover, as Chu points out, even though Tseng's insights were the basis for his perceptions

61 Chu's primer was the *Lun-yü yao-I* 論語要義.

62 Chu Hsi, *Chu-tzu yü-lei*, p. 1636(40:3b; *ca.* 1189).

63 *Ibid.*, p.1640 (40:5b; *ca.* 1180); cf. Ch'ien Mu, *Chu-tzu hsin-hsüeh-an*, p. 411.

into nature and his carefree attitude,[64] they lacked practicality, a clear method (*kung-fu* 工夫) to transform the insight into reality.

In this vein, elsewhere Chu says that Tseng's ambitions were vast but that we can't really evaluate them. Chu then draws the following analogy :

> As with water, let's imagine that Tseng Tien's practical efforts were like the water's source and that the practical efforts of the other three disciples like the water's circulation. If you put your efforts into the place where the stream branches off, then they will be scattered to the four seas. So, I fear that Tseng was unable to restrain himself in stating his ambitions and thus may be considered eccentric (*k'uang*).[65]

On the issue of Tseng's eccentric character, Chu Hsi cites Mencius on this,[66] claiming that Tseng could understand the sageliness of Yao and Shun but could not emulate the actions of such worthies[67] and was far different

---

64 D.T. Suzuki, in his debate with Hu Shih on the nature of Ch'an Buddhism, discusses the term *t'eng-t'eng* 騰騰, a relaxed state without anxiety, which parallels the "turning of the wheel," of *jen-yun* 任運, and which he connects with the discussion under consideration here, specifically Tseng Tien's description of his projected outing at the River I (D.T. Suzuki, "Zen: A Reply to Hu Shih," *Philosophy East and West*, 3 [1953], pp. 30-31); for Suzuki, Tseng Tien's insights into the rhythmic pattern in nature were the likely source for his carefree attitude.

65 *Chu-tzu yü-lei*, 40: 10a-b (p. 1650). This piece cannot be dated, but Ch'ien Mu feels that the dialogues with Li Chuang-tsu 李壯祖, like this one, are from Chu's later years(*Chu-tzu hsin-hsüeh-an*, pp. 417 and 422).

66 *Chu-tzu yü-lei*, 40: 5a (p. 1639), in a discussion with Ch'en Ch'un 陳淳(1153-1217; *ca.* 1190-1191) and 40: 8a (p. 1645), in a discussion with Wu Pi-ta 吳必大, *ca.* 1188-1189.

67 Ibid., 40: 9a (p. 1647; ca. 1190); cf. Ch'ien Mu, *Chu-tzu hsin-hsüeh-an*, pp. 420-423.

from his son Tseng Ts'an (Tseng-tzu) in this regard.[68] But instead of characterizing Tseng as "wildly ambitious" or as one who "rushes forward out of control," as Mencius does, Chu defines *k'uang* in Tseng's case as pointing to a gap between vision and method and thus a tendency toward Bohemian behavior. This differs from the Ch'eng brothers, who referred to Tseng's so-called "wildness" as the key to his understanding of Confucius' goals. So Chu's criticism about vision and method is a bit forced : was it really necessary for Tseng, or for anyone, to offer a detailed justification for a carefree approach to life? And was Tseng really "acting out" in an unrestrained manner?

According to Chu Hsi, Tseng Tien's unconventional attitudes reflected the Taoist tendency toward self-absorption associated with Chuang-tzu, Lao-tzu, and Lieh-tzu, and also the Buddhists, serious charges to level at a Confucian disciple, to be sure.[69] Yet in an exchange with a disciple, Chu is forced to admit that a lapse into Taoism may not be the worst thing:

> ... as to one's worrying about a lapse into Taoism he [Yeh Ho-sun] asked why Tung-lai(Lü Tsu-ch'ien) thought of Tseng Tien as lacking breadth, and Chu said: 'He was too broad in his outlook so that his method lacked detail. According to what Ming-tao (Ch'eng Hao) said about K'ang-chieh (Shao Yung), "Yao-fu(Shao)was a heroically distinguished scholar, but basically not down-to-earth." ' He (Chu) went on to say: 'It's

68 *Chu-tzu yü-lei*, 40: 10a-b and 40: 11b (p. 1652; *ca.* 1198).

69 *Ibid.*, 40:3a-4a (pp. 1635-1637), 40: 7b (p. 1644), and 40: 9b (p. 1648); cf. Ch'ien Mu, *Chu-tzu hsin-hsüeh-an*, pp. 411-412.

> really laughable that people are fearful of becoming a Lao (-tzu) or a Chuang (-tzu) but not a Kuan (Chung) or a Shang (Yang)!'[70]

Unlike his earlier *Analects* commentary, here Chu does not praise Tseng Tien for having a profound vision because, in Chu's view, Tseng's broad outlook was impractical. On the other hand, Chu isn't unnecessarily worried about possible lapse into Taoism: a lapse into the Legalist thinking of Kuan Chung and Shang Yang would be a more dangerous transgression.

But does Tseng's carefree spirit necessarily mean that he was impractical or a crypto-Taoist? It is more likely that Tseng's behavior and response at the conclave suggest a need for balance between the practical and the carefree in one's life and in one's state of mind, as well as a desire to be individualistic. This balance hardly requires a detailed methodology, and in later eras it often took the form of a Confucian-Taoist syncretism, which we shall discuss in the concluding section of this essay.

In *Reflections on Things at Hand* (*Chin-ssu lu* 近思錄), completed in 1175, Chu Hsi, like the Ch'eng brothers, links Tseng Tien with Ch'i-tiao K'ai because the two "understood the basic idea" promoted by Confucius,

---

70 *Chu-tzu yü-lei*, 40:4a (p. 1637; this dialogue with Yeh Ho-sun 葉賀孫 is dated *ca.* 1191). Lu Tsü-ch'ien 呂祖謙 (Tung-lai 東萊; 1137-1181), was the co-compiler with Chu Hsi of the Neo-Confucian anthology *Chin-ssu lu* 近思錄. Kuan Chung 管仲 (fl. mid-seventh c. B.C.) was Chief Minister to Duke Huan 桓 of the state of Ch'i 齊 and was responsible for the development of that kingdom's wealth and power. Shang Yang 商鞅 (d. 338 B.C.), or Lord Shang, was a minister in the state of Ch'in 秦 whose political and economic reforms strengthened that realm before it unified the Chinese world. Both are associated with the Legalist school of thought.

which Chu defines as moral principle.[71] Yeh Ts'ai 葉采 (fl. *ca.* 1248), in commenting on the link that Chu makes between Tseng and Ch'i-tiao says:

> When Tseng Tien expressed his wishes, he .... was natural and at ease with himself and had the feeling of being well adjusted to everything. When Confucius advised Ch'i-tiao K'ai to become an official, the latter said, 'I do not yet have the confidence to do so.' K'ai of course understood the principle, but in his daily dealings with affairs he was not so confident that in every respect he was in accord with it....Therefore he...aimed at complete self-confidence. Although the two pupils did not succeed in what they wanted to do, they both understood the basic idea of the Sage.[72]

Yeh's and Chu's conclusions lead one to believe that Confucius' "basic idea" could include both Tseng Tien's carefree spirit and Ch'i-tiao K'ai's aspiring to the complete self-confidence he deemed necessary in order to assume official position. Thus in this earlier analysis, Chu Hsi seems to appreciate Tseng's individualistic and candid reaction to Confucius.

In his *Classified Conversations* from a later period, Chu elaborates on this comparison of Ch'i-tiao and Tseng: even though they may have grasped

---

71 Chan, W.T., *Reflections on Things at Hand* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 55; *Chu-tzu yü-lei*, 8:2b(p. 210). The Ch'eng brothers are the source of the view that Ch'i-tiao understood Confucius' basic idea (*ibid.*, 40:10a, p. 1649 and 40:12a; p. 1653; cf. Ch'ien Mu, *Chu-tzu hsin-hsüeh-an*, pp. 423-427). Yet, as Lu Hsiang-shan points out, the brothers differed in their views of Tseng Tien (see above, p. 31).

72 Yeh Ts'ai, *Chin-ssu lu chi-chueh*, 2.18; trans. in Chan, W. T., *Reflections on Things at Hand* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 55; see *Analects*, 5:5 (Legge, I, p. 174) for the exchange between Confucius and Ch'i-tiao K'ai.

the basic idea, it was Ch'i-tiao who knew what the details were, as exhibited in his measured response to Confucius about the confidence needed to assume official position.[73] Ironically, even though Ch'i-tiao may have been clearer in understanding Confucian principles, that understanding led ultimately to reclusive behavior.

As Ch'ien Mu points out, Tseng's outlook was expansive, whereas Ch'i-tiao aimed at something profoundly secure.[74] Ch'ien's suggestion that Tseng was perceptive but impractical blends well with Chu's Taoist characterization of Tseng. As we have seen, in his *Classified Conversations*, Chu Hsi also linked Tseng Tien with the reclusive Shao Yung, whom Ch'eng Hao felt was not "down to earth" and whom Chu Hsi feels was Taoistic in his later years.[75] Chu believed that when it came to public activities, Tseng embraced a withdrawing position that derived from his impractical, carefree attitude, whereas Ch'i-tiao's withdrawing nature derived from a sober assessment of his own abilities. In reality, though, Tseng was neither a Taoist Bohemian nor an eremite like Ch'i-tiao K'ai.

In the end, what is Chu's view of Tseng Tien? There is a difference between his opinions in *Reflections on Things at Hand* (written about 1175) and those in the *Analects* commentary (written about 1176), which praise Tseng's insight into reality, and his later views, as expressed in the dialogues in his *Classified Conversations* in the 1180s and 1190s. In the latter, Chu's view of Tseng is more negative: he de-legitimizes Tseng by connecting him with Taoists, Buddhists and recluses and accuses him of being *k'uang* because he lacks a methodology to go with his insights. We should also note,

73 *Chu-tzu yu-lei*, 40:5b (p. 1640) and 40:10a (p. 1649).

74 Ch'ien Mu, *Chu-tzu hsin-hsüeh-an*, pp. 426-427.

75 *Chu-tzu yü-lei*, 40:9b(p. 1636; ca. 1191).

however, that Chu does not connect Tseng's eccentricity (his *k'uang*-ness) with that of Chieh-yu 接輿, the Madman of Ch'u 楚, whom Confucius met *ca.* 489, and whose warning for Confucius about the meaninglessness of official service derived from his reclusive instincts.[76]

Ch'ien Mu notes Chu's shift in his view of Tseng Tien, but he does not refer to specific dates; he does say that Chu's earlier favorable opinions were modeled on the views of the Ch'eng brothers, presumably Ch'eng Hao.[77] It seems possible that Chu's more critical views emerged after 1175, in the wake of the Goose Lake debates with Lu Hsiang-shan, when the rivalry between him and Lu developed. Lu's "method of simplification" in learning and scholarship was roundly criticized by Chu Hsi. Chu desired a detailed approach to classical study leading to practical application, which he thought was undermined by Lu's reliance on introspective insight and immediate moral application.[78]

In these respects, Tseng's ideas were too close to Lu's, and the on-going debate may have colored Chu's later interpretations of Tseng Tien and made him less inclined to appreciate the real Tseng Tien, even though, in the end, Tseng may have been less reclusive than the more restrained Ch'i-tiao, whom Chu seems to favor. Perhaps this lack of appreciation made Chu less likely to understand the real Confucius. Yet Chu was at pains to side-step the Tseng Tien issue because he had to respect Ch'eng Hao, and this perhaps

---

76 *Analects*, 18: 5 (Legge, I, pp. 332-333).

77 Ch'ien Mu, "Differences", pp. 63-64 and *Chu-tzu hsin-hsüeh-an*, p. 427.

78 On the Goose Lake debates, see Julia Ching, "The Goose Lake Monastery Debate (1175)", *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 1 (1974), pp. 161-178 and Chan Wing-tsit 陳榮捷，〈朱陸鵝湖之會補述〉("Supplementary Details on the Meeting Between Chu and Lu at the Goose Lake"), in *Chung-hua wen-hua fu-hsing yüeh-k'an* 中華文化復興月刊，11 (1978), pp. 41-46.

explains the intellectual contortions he goes through.[79]

Chu Hsi agrees with Mencius that the *k'uang* types stand out but are basically shallow. Chu felt that Confucius wanted to restrain such bright but erratic and eccentric people and that his desire to return to his home state of Lu *circa* 492-489 was based on a need to rein in the over-zealous students there.[80] This takes some liberties with what we read in the *Analects* passage dealing with this issue (5:21): if the discussion took place between these years, then it is more likely that Confucius wished to return to Lu because he missed the enthusiasm and spirited brilliance of those students. After experiencing so much frustration in his attempt to spread his message elsewhere, would Confucius have aspired to the role of a martinet?

As for Lu Hsiang-shan, we have noted above that he cites the Ch'eng brothers in supporting the Tseng Tien spirit. When Lu says that Ch'eng I lost that spirit, this is also a subtle way of criticizing Chu Hsi, who inherited Ch'eng I's scholarly approach. Instead, Lu praises Ch'eng Hao because he preserved the carefree Tseng Tien spirit. Ch'eng Hao was also close to Lu in terms of metaphysics and methodology, especially in his monistic view of reality and criticism of textual exegesis.

In supporting the Tseng Tien spirit, Lu opts for an untrammeled state of mind, not Taoist withdrawal or Bohemianism. Chu Hsi, on the other hand, seems unable to reconcile this kind of mental freedom with serious politics and scholarship. Was Chu afraid that his students would, in today's parlance, "blow off" their worldly responsibilities? For Chu Hsi, Tseng's attitude was just too freewheeling: one's attitude was crucial in approaching any situation,

79 Ch'ien Mu, *Chu-tzu hsin-hsüeh-an*, p. 434.
80 Ching, pp. 25-26.

and neither Lu's method of simplification nor Tseng Tien's free-spiritedness was serious or profound enough to make a difference in the practical world. We can easily see why Chu would rather embrace Ch'i-tiao's principled eremitism than Tseng's unbridled spirit.

Does the problem of interpreting Tseng Tien relate to opinions about study and worldly service? It may be that the Tseng Tien spirit sheds light on the contrast between "honoring the virtuous nature" (*tsun te-hsing*尊德性) and "maintaining constant inquiry and study" (*tao wen-hsüeh*道問學), two ideas found in the *Doctrine of the Mean* (chapter twenty-seven)[81] that were debated by Lu Hsiang-shan and Chu Hsi and used by later commentators to characterize the two thinkers, respectively, in terms of their points of emphasis. In fact, by the Ming era, sides had been taken and much ink spilled in discussing this issue.[82]

Despite the polemics, the issue really was not cultivation versus study. Both Chu and Lu wished to balance the two, even though Chu admitted that his students tended to focus more on exegesis and Lu's on practice.[83] It was more a matter of attitude, and we can see that the differing opinions on the Tseng Tien spirit parallel the methodological contrast. For example, Lu's view on study for the civil service examinations was that it should not restrict one's mind, even though it necessarily limited a student's intellectual

---

81 Legge, I, p. 422.

82 Criticism of the Yüan dynasty scholar-thinker Wu Ch'eng吳澄(1249-1333) on this issue may have crystallized the dichotomy; see David Gedalecia, *A Solitary Crane in a Spring Grove: The Confucian Scholar Wu Ch'eng in Mongol China* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000), pp. 96-101.

83 See Lu Hsiang-shan 陸象山, *Hsiang-shan hsien-sheng ch'üan-chi*象山先生全集, (*SPTK*), *ts'e* 8, 34:8a. cf. Wing-tsit Chan, *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), p.582; also cf. Lu's *nien-p'u*年譜in *ts'e* 10, 36:20a-b.

development.[84] Was the Tseng Tien spirit akin to Lu's attitude? We may compare this with Chu His's view that a student just had to get through it and not let them be an impediment.[85] Lu more pointedly suggests that the formulaic learning tested in the examination system may have a deadening effect on one's mental well-being, the essence of the Tseng Tien spirit.

Wang Yang-ming and Tseng Tien

The great Ming thinker Wang Yang-ming approved of the Tseng Tien spirit and shared the enthusiasm of both Ch'eng Hao and Lu Hsiang-shan for Tseng's carefree attitude about life. And it is probably no coincidence that there is an ideological link among these three thinkers in other respects. A passage from Wang's *Instructions for Practical Living* (*Ch'uan-hsi lu* 傳習錄), illustrating what Wang regards as Confucius' broad-mindedness, and also comparing Tseng Tien with the reclusive Ch'i-tiao K'ai, reads:

> [The Teacher said,] '[When Confucius advised Ch'i-tiao K'ai (540-c.450 B.C.) to become an official], the latter said, "I do not yet have the confidence to do so." Confucius was pleased. When Tzu-lu [542-480 B.C.] got Tzu-kao [b.521B.C.] appointed governor of Pi, Confucius said, "You are doing an injury to someone's son."

84 Lu Hsiang-shan, *Hsiang-shan hsien-sheng ch'üan-chi*, *ts'e* 3, 11:11a-b, *ts'e* 6, 23:1b-2a, and *ts'e* 10, 36:12a-b.

85 David S. Nivison, "Protest Against Conventions and Conventions of Protest," in Arthur F. Wright, ed., *The Confucian Persuasion* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960), pp. 191-192.

> When Tseng Tien [father of Tseng-tzu, 505-c.436 B.C.] expressed his wish, Confucius gave his approval. From these we can see what the Sage had in mind.'[86]

Another passage reads:

> I asked, 'When Confucius' disciples expressed their wishes, Tzu-lu and Jan Ch'iu [522-c.462B.C.] chose governmental positions and Kung-hsi Hua [b. 509 B.C.] chose ceremonies and music. How practical they were! But when Tseng Tien expressed his wishes, they seemed to be frivolous, and yet Confucius approved of him. What does it mean?'
>
> 'The three other disciples were opinionated and dogmatic. When one is opinionated and dogmatic, one inevitably becomes one-sided. He may be able to do one thing but not the other. The attitude of Tseng Tien shows that he was neither opinionated nor dogmatic. It means that he "does what is proper to his position and does not want to go beyond it. If he is in the midst of barbarous tribes, he does what is proper in the midst of barbarous tribes. In a position of difficulty and danger, he does what is proper in a position of difficulty and danger. He can find himself in no situation in which he is not at ease with himself. The other three disciples may be described as utensils, that is, specific and

86 Translation in Wing-tsit Chan, *Instructions for Practical Living and Other Neo-Confucian Writings by Wang Yang-ming* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), p. 30. The episode involving Tzu-lu and Tzu-kao 子羔 occurs in the *Analects*, 11:24 (Legge, I, p. 246).

> therefore limited in their usefulness. Tseng Tien's indication was that he was not such a utensil. Nevertheless, the three disciples" talents were all outstanding and excellent; they were unlike people of today who lack substance but have only empty words. This is why Confucius approved of all of them.'[87]

Wang goes beyond defending Confucius' acceptance of Tseng Tien and supports Tseng for being at ease in fulfilling worldly responsibilities and avoiding a hidebound, dogmatic attitude. Moreover, he defends Tseng against charges that he was frivolous in his actions and in his statement in the discussion with Confucius.

Wang's *Instructions for Practical Living* also includes the following passage:

> The Teacher said, 'The teachings of the Sage are not so restrictive or difficult to endure, and do not mean that people should assume the appearance of a rigid, strict schoolman.'
> Ju-chung commented. 'This can be seen somewhat in the chapter about Confucius and Tseng Tien telling their wishes.'
> The Teacher said, 'Right. From this chapter we can see how broad, great, and all-embracing the disposition of the Sage was. Furthermore, when the Master asked his pupils about their wishes, the other three answered seriously. Tseng Tien, however, was quite carefree, ignored the other three, and went so far as to play the lute!

87 *Ibid.*, p. 31. The internal quotation is from the *Doctrine of the Mean*, chapter fourteen (Legge, I., p. 395).

> What an unrestrained attitude! When it came to telling his wishes, Tseng Tien did not answer the Master's particular question. What he said were words of unrestraint. I-ch'uan [Ch'eng I] would have scolded Tseng Tien. But instead the Sage praised him. What a disposition! In the Sage's way of teaching people, he did not restrict them or treat them all alike. If a pupil was unrestrained, he brought him to perfection through his restraint. How can people's abilities be the same?'[88]

Wang's comments here are interesting. On the one hand, he says that Tseng Tien's statement at the conclave was a model of unrestraint praised by Confucius, and on the other that Confucius found ways to perfect those who were either restrained or unrestrained, which elaborates his views on Confucius' broad-mindedness. The contradiction is only an apparent one: Confucius seems to have employed restraint or tolerated unrestraint depending on the student's progress in self-cultivation, a kind of Confucian version of the Buddhist "skill in means," or *upāya* (*fang-pien* 方便). Moreover, Wang says that Ch'eng I would have chided Tseng for his unrestraint, suggesting that the younger Ch'eng brother was too doctrinaire in his pedagogy, an opinion Wang shares with Lu Hsiang-shan. Above all, Wang suggests that Tseng Tien's unrestraint reveals an appreciation of Confucius' desire to cultivate individuality in his students.

Wang's grandfather had often taught his students the following:

> If the student can appreciate the spirit of Tseng Tien, wherever he

88 Wing-tsit Chan, *Instructions for Practical Living*, p. 215.

goes he will feel sprightly and self-possessed (*tzu-te*).[89]

In discussing Wang Yang-ming's affinity for Tseng Tien, Tu Wei-ming, who cites Shimada Kenji and Julia Ching in his analysis of Tseng Tien, feels that Tseng's carefree spirit was clearly Taoistic and openly supported on that basis by Confucius. Moreover, Tu feels that even if Wang Yang-ming was trying to "dress up" Taoist ideas in Confucian garb, for him the "spirit of Tseng Tien was more than a fascinating topic in intellectual discourse; it was a guiding principle for daily conduct and an integral part of his personality."[90] As Tu points out: "the self-righteous scholar-official could learn a great deal from the seemingly carefree Taoists in order to become a better Confucian."[91] In other words, the Tseng Tien spirit could allow one to grasp the truth of things, principle, in greater depth and on a personal basis. Late in his life, Wang wrote a poem in which he expresses this close affinity for Tseng Tien:

> Now I doubt Chu Hsi's words--
> So much shadow and echo,
> And I'd be ashamed to sound
> Like Cheng Hsuan[92]-- split and scattered.
> But there was that Tien

89 Tu Wei-ming, *Neo-Confucian Thought in Action: Wang Yang-ming's Youth (1472-1509)*(Berkeley: University of California Press), p. 73. The term tzu-te 自得 suggests the idea of arriving at the truth for oneself.

90 Tu, pp. 74-75.

91 Tu, p. 79.

92 The Han scholar Cheng Hsuan 鄭玄 (127-200) was known for his exhaustive classical commentaries but was often criticized in Yüan and Ming times for exegetical excess.

Who set his lute down
Still vibrating from the wind--
O, he was wild, but makes my heart glad.[93]

Apparently Wang felt that Tseng Tien's carefree attitude was exemplary because his worldly responsibilities were no handicap to his enlightened spirit. And it is this apparent "two-track" approach to life that we shall examine next.

Tseng Tien and Neo-Taoism

Because the Tseng Tien spirit is syncretic, blending a Taoist sensibility with a Confucian sense of responsibility, one can't help but sense some similarities to the ideas of the Neo-Taoists of the Wei-Chin魏晉period, namely those of Wang Pi 王弼(226-249 A. D.) and Kuo Hsiang郭象(d. *circa* 312 A. D.). Both Wang and Kuo felt that Confucius was the true sage, despite the fact that they wrote commentaries on the *Lao-tzu*老子and the *Chuang-tzu* 莊子, not the *Analects*. And even though neither Wang nor Kuo refers directly to the Tseng Tien spirit, their message embraced a similar kind of mental freedom, no matter what worldly tasks one faced. For example, Kuo Hsiang said:

Although the sage is in the midst of government, his mind seems to be in the mountain forest...His abode is in the myriad things, but it

93 Tu, p. 77.

does not mean that he does not wander freely.[94]

This balance between sublime and mundane in Neo-Taoism that is so much associated with the eclectic, harmonizing Chinese cultural ethos is really foreshadowed in the Tseng Tien spirit. Might Wang Pi's and Kuo Hsiang's view that Confucius was the true sage be justified by our analysis of the Tseng Tien spirit? Kuo apparently perceived the spontaneity and insight of the "inner Confucius," the sage who, unlike Lao-tzu, never spoke about the absolute because he was perfectly identified with it.[95] While usually the Neo-Taoist view of Confucius as the true sage is considered idiosyncratic, an attempts to break through conventional attitudes about sagehood, it is possible that Wang and Kuo chose Confucius because they sensed in him a deeper sensibility about sagehood than they saw in the Taoist sages. And this sensibility is attested in Confucius' endorsement of Tseng Tien's approach to life. Moreover, in Confucius' time, the distinction between Taoist and Confucian ideas was not as clear-cut as it came to be a few centuries later. In fact, Wang and Kuo may have realized this and looked back nostagically to a time when those ideas shared a more harmonious common ground.

F. S. C. Northrop quotes Tseng's response to Confucius as an example of the immediately apprehended aestheticism he contrasts with Western analytical thought.[96] Here we are reminded of the calligraphy of the T'ang

---

94 *Nan-hua chen-ching* (*Chuang-tzu*)南華眞經(莊子)(*SPTK*), 1:11b-14b (Kuo Hsiang's commentary on chapter one of the *Chuang-tzu*, on "wandering freely," *hsiao-yao* 逍遙); translation found in Wing-tsit Chan, *A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy*, pp. 327-328.

95 Fung Yu-lan, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy*, Derk Bodde, ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 218-219 ; cf. Chan, *A Source Book*, p. 333 (comment).

96 F. S. C. Northrop, *The Meeting of East and West: An Inquiry Concerning World Understanding* (New York: Macmillan, 1946), pp. 322-323.

monk Huai Su 懷素, which, as in his rendering of the *Thousand-Character Classic* (*Ch'ien-tzu wen* 千字文), is termed *k'uang ts'ao-shu* 狂草書, or "mad grass-style writing." Using a standard text (in this case, a sixth-century A.D. primer[97]) as a vehicle for calligraphic artistry is common among the great Chinese calligraphers, but in Huai's case, he goes one step further : in improvising on the textual theme, he ventures into abstraction through his eccentric style, and his improvisations are designed to achieve a mental breakthrough that puts him in closer touch with reality and self-expression.[98]

The connection between eccentricity and aesthetic sensitivity also brings to mind some of the stories we read concerning the Wei-Chin school of pure conversation, *ch'ing-t'an* 清談. For example, Wang Hui-chih 王徽之 (d. *ca.* 388 A.D.), in following his impulse, embarked on a long journey in the middle of the night to visit a well-known hermit, yet when he arrived at the door, he turned and went back home. When asked the reason for such bizarre behavior, Wang said: "'I came on the impulse, and when the impulse ended, I returned...'"[99] Wang's eccentricitiy typifies the Neo-Taoist proclivity for activities that are not goal-oriented, that opt for appreciation of the moment. Certainly, such behavior is consonant with the Tseng Tien spirit, but it is also the key to perceiving some of the recondite features of original Confucianism through a Taoist lens. And these features are more than Taoist

97 The *Thousand-Character Classic* was composed between 507 and 521 A.D. during the Liang dynasty (501-531) by Chou Hsing-ssu 周興嗣; it antedates the simpler *Three-Character Classic* (*San-tzu ching* 三字經) by several hundred years.

98 See Chiang Yee, *Chinese Calligraphy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 97.

99 This story is from the *Shih-shuo hsin-yü* 世說新語 (*SPTK*), chapter 23, and translations may be found in Fung Yu-lan, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy* (New York: Free Press, 1966), pp. 235-236) and Holmes Welch, *Taoism: The Parting of the Way* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), p. 125.

overlays or accretions; rather, they represent a broadly shared vision of reality in classical Chinese thought.

But is the Tseng Tien spirit a "two-track" approach, in which life is experienced on two planes of reality? In his *Spirit of Chinese Philosophy*, Fung Yu-lan points out that the early Taoists, Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu, aimed for the sublime reality beyond the worldly plane; that the Neo-Taoists, Wang Pi and Kuo Hsiang, and the early Buddhist Seng-chao 僧肇(384-414) tried to synthesize two courses, the sublime and the mundane; and that the Buddhist Tao-sheng 道生(d. 434) and later Ch'an Buddhists arrived at one course, wherein the daily tasks (in the case of Ch'an, carrying water and chopping wood) were the same as the enlightened state. Fung goes on to say that the next step was to ask whether or not this identification (not just a synthesis) of sublime and mundane could be found only in these daily activities of monks. The answer, Fung says, was given by the Neo-Confucians, who advanced the idea that performance of the daily ethical tasks could also be identified with the sublime truth.[100] And for some Neo-Confucians, this answer was prefigured in the Tseng Tien spirit, which is inherent in the Confucian vision of reality.

Conclusion

It is clear from the arguments advanced in this essay that the spirit of Tseng Tien is essentially an identification of sublime and mundane that anticipates the later Neo-Taoist synthesis and the more unconventional

---

100 Fung Yu-lan, *The Spirit of Chinese Philosophy*, E. R. Hughes, tr. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), pp. 155, 174, and 200.

tendencies in the Neo-Confucian outlook. Both Lu Hsiang-shan and Wang Yang-ming saw this and legitimized the Tseng Tien spirit in Neo-Confucianism, citing Ch'eng Hao's affinity for it and clearly distinguishing themselves from both Ch'eng I and Chu Hsi. Tu Wei-ming points out that Wang's high regard for Tseng was based on their shared desire to break through Confucian rigidity and because Tseng had the "ability to transcend the sordid bustle of political life without losing a sense of profound care for basic humanistic values."[101] This may sound like Kuo Hsiang's ideal, namely, a "two-track" synthesis of sublime and mundane, but from examining Tseng Tien, we see that it is more likely that Tseng was identifying the two: his ambition as described was not goal-oriented; his lute playing and poetics constituted *the answer itself*. And this is what so pleased Confucius, who, as Simon Leys points out, "in his unexpected support for Zeng Dian's [Tseng Tien's] choice,...reveals himself as a man for whom contemplation takes precedence over all other values."[102] Moreover, in terms of education, Confucius reveals himself as a teacher who deeply appreciated spontaneity in his students and who wanted them to express their innermost desires, not merely tell their mentor what they thought he wanted to hear.

Tseng Tien's response to Confucius pleased both Lu Hsiang-shan and Wang Yang-ming because it located the source for mental illumination in human experience and the ethical responsibilities of daily living in a spontaneous way. It should have also pleased Chu Hsi. But in the long run his displeasure did not diminish the inherent value of the Tseng Tien spirit in typifying an aesthetic appreciation of human experience that was influential

101 Tu, p. 117.
102 Leys, pp. 173-174.

in shaping the Chinese world-view, and which, like the tones that faded from the strings of Tseng Tien's lute at the conclave some 2,500 years ago, resonates in any number of creative ways in present-day thinking.[103]

103 In accepting the position as head of Taipei's Cultural Affairs Bureau in November, 1999, social critic Lun Ying-t'ai 龍應台(b. 1952), the author of *Wild Fire*, said that after browsing through the *Analects*, she realized that, like Tseng Tien, she had for the past twenty years preferred to live a carefree life unencumbered by political responsibilities but was "now willing to follow the footsteps of Kung-his Hua and study the ways of the administration in order to lead the city's cultural affairs" (*Taipei Times*, Online Edition, November 7, 1999, pp. 2-3).

武廟的崛起與衰微(七至十四世紀)
——一個政治文化的考察

黃進興
中央研究院歷史語言研究所研究員

於帝國祀典中，文、武廟呈對舉的狀態。文廟用來祭祀儒教宗師——孔子，武廟則是祭祀齊太公呂尙的。呂氏因輔佐周文、武王奠定周代基業，流芳後世。始自唐朝初年正式成爲官方祀典，迄洪武二十年(1387)爲明太祖所廢置，武廟綿延幾達七個世紀。從建置至廢除爲止，武廟所透露中國政治文化的特色頗有可觀之處，本文擬以歷史的分析揭露此一獨特的面相。

一、從地方信仰躍為帝國祀典

太公望呂尙(本姓姜氏，名尙，字牙，俗稱「姜子牙」，從其封姓故曰「呂尙」)貴爲文武師，滅殷居功厥偉。武王封功臣謀士，太公爲首封，封於營丘曰「齊」，遂爲周初齊國創業之君[1]；故齊國境內必置

1 呂尚其人其事以及齊國後續發展，參閱司馬遷：《史記》(台北：泰順書局，1971)，卷4，頁127；卷32，頁1480。

有宗廟以奉祀。齊滅之後，宗廟不存，血緣之祭亦告斷絕。惟《魏書・地理志》載汲縣保有「比干墓、太公廟」[2]，可見太公依舊留存於地方的民俗信仰。《大唐郊祀錄》謂「史籍無恆祭太公之文」，蓋專就官方祀典而言[3]。此一情況，至唐代則大爲改觀。

今存唐時文獻雖對官方太公開廟記載不一，惟自唐初立國以降，太公祭祀漸嶄露頭角。首先，依照隋制，先代帝制祀典中，同祭周文王、武王於灃渭之郊，而以周公、召公配[4]；但於唐顯慶二年(657)，卻採父子分祭的形式，一祭周文王於灃，取太公配；另別祭武王於鎬，仍以周公、召公配[5]。按文王由岐下徙都豐邑，武王營作鎬京，地理上各具意義[6]；然而顯慶二年爲何採行文武分祭，令人費解，惟太公得緣陪祀之故，進入帝國祀典卻是不爭的事實。

尤需留意的，之前朝廷已於貞觀年間(627-649)初祀太公於磻溪一地[7]。據酈道元的《水經注》，磻溪自古爲名勝之地，乃呂尚未遇文王，垂釣之處[8]。倘若《唐太宗李衛公問對》的成書可信，則從太宗與李靖的對話中，君臣悉奉太公爲兵學圭臬一事，則太公得專祀於磻溪，絕非偶然[9]。復查《舊唐書・職官志》載有：

> 舊有太公廟令，武德年七品下，永徽二年加從五品上，開元二

---

2 魏收，《魏書》(台北：鼎文書局，1980)，卷106上，頁2458。

3 王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》(上海古籍出版社，續修四庫全書)，卷10，頁9下。

4 杜佑，《通典》(北京：中華書局，1988)，卷53，頁1477。

5 劉昫，《舊唐書》(台北：鼎文書局，1979)，卷24，頁915。

6 司馬遷，《史記》，卷4，頁118，129-130。

7 王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》，卷10，頁9下。

8 王國維校，《水經注箋》(上海人民出版社，1984)，卷17，頁582-583。

9 歷來對《唐太宗李衛公問對》的成書頗多爭議，參見吳如嵩、王顯臣校注，《李衛公問對校注》(北京：中華書局，1983)，頁84-96。並請比較D. L. McMullen, "The Cult of Ch'i Tai-Kung and T'ang Attitude to the Military", *T'ang Studies* 7(1989), 59-103. 普林斯頓大學陸揚教授賜知此文，謹此致謝。

十四年省也[10]。

武德(618-628)、永徽(650-655)為高祖、高宗年號，其時既有「太公廟令」專司太公祭祀，理應設有太公廟；蓋逢經邦大典粗備，故官品迭有更動。則天朝，崔融為中宗(時為太子)所撰的《修書表》中錄有：「皇慈渥洽，帝獎伏隆，擢公望為太師，徵子房為少傅」之辭[11]，可見太公聲譽日隆，並預徵子房來日配享太公。中宗神龍二年(706)，兩京分置「太公廟署」，不久即廢[12]；而朝廷在開元十九年(731)，終於正式下詔兩京及天下諸州，各置「太公尚父廟」一所，以張良配享，春秋取仲月上戊日祭祀[13]。至此，太公廟遍佈天下，其在帝國祀典的主祀地位完全底定。傳統典章之作，輒取是時為太公開廟的里程碑[14]。

此外，開元十九年的詔令之所以值得大筆特書，由於它明白制定太公廟的祭祀功能，除了春秋例祭，兼規定：

諸州賓貢武舉人，準明經進士，行鄉飲酒禮[15]。

同時「每出師命將，辭訖，發日，便就廟引辭」[16]。自是太公廟同孔廟形成釋奠禮的兩橛，缺一不可。例如：官修且成書於開元二十六年(738)的《唐六典》，便明列國家祀典有四：

---

10 劉昫，《舊唐書》，卷42，頁1795。

11 彭叔夏，《文苑英華》(台北：華文書局，1967)，卷605，頁6上。崔融為中宗為春宮時的侍讀，中宗於聖曆元年(698)立為太子。參見劉昫，《舊唐書》卷7，頁135；卷94，頁2996。

12 王溥，《唐會要》(台北：世界書局，1960)，卷65，頁1134；歐陽修，《新唐書》(台北：鼎文書局，1979)，卷48，頁1246-1247。

13 杜佑，《通典》，卷53，頁1483；又劉昫，《舊唐書》，卷8，頁196。

14 例如，《舊唐書》、《新唐書》、《通典》、《唐會要》等等。

15 杜佑，《通典》，卷53，頁1483。

16 同上。

一曰祀天神，二曰祭地祇，三曰享人鬼，四曰釋奠於先聖先師[17]。

末項的釋奠禮細分則包括孔宣父與齊太公的祀典。王涇的《大唐郊祀錄》撰於孔宣父、齊太公追封為「王」之後，故改稱祭祀文宣王、武成王為「釋奠」禮[18]。諸如種種均宣示文、武廟的祀典已成釋奠禮的定式。

要之，歷來朝廷追祭孔聖的經典根據無非《禮記》一書。《禮記・文王世子》中即謂：

凡學，春官釋奠于其先師，秋冬亦如之[19]。

又說：

凡始立學，必釋奠于先聖先師，及行事，必以幣[20]。

故自東漢以來，歷代祭祀孔聖於辟雍、太學或國子監趨於常規[21]；此事前人耳熟能詳，惟未曾聞有釋奠儀涵括太公之舉。是故，唐初驟然提升太公之祭，甚值關注。

攸關此一祀典，史料殘缺，難以全解。惟細繹該時禮書的疏解，或可略窺一二。唐初解經大儒——孔穎達(574-648)於闡釋《禮記・文王

17 李林甫，《唐六典》(北京：中華書局，1992)，卷4，頁120。
18 王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》，卷1，頁2上。
19 孫希旦，《禮記集解》(北京：中華書局，1989)，卷20，頁559。
20 同上，頁560。
21 請參閱拙作〈權力與信仰：孔廟祭祀制度的形成〉，收入拙著《優入聖域》(台北：允晨文化公司，1994)，頁163-216；又秦蕙田，《五禮通考》(桃園：聖環圖書公司，1994)，卷117，頁16上-24下。

世子》的「釋奠」禮，曾云：

凡釋奠有六：始立學，釋奠一也；四時釋奠有四，通前五也；〈王制〉師還釋奠於學，六也[22]。

孔氏所言，前五項「釋奠」包括「立學」與「四時致祭」，前代行之久遠，應是實錄。末項則是醞釀中的新制，故頗有推波助瀾之功。況且孔氏適時地訴諸《禮記・王制》作爲新制的理據，原來該篇固曾說過：

出征，執有罪，反，釋奠于學，以訊馘告[23]。

據此，則釋奠禮需統括文武，方爲賅備。而唐初立國，亟求規模宏遠，文治武功本不得偏廢；作爲帝國祀典的釋奠禮，倘有若是的擴充，允爲得當。故高祖武德年間，既立周公、孔子廟，間及太公廟，原可理解[24]。

話說如此，猶有疑點懸而待決：那就是齊太公何以會在眾多武人之中雀屏中選呢？這便涉及呂尚的歷史形象了。上古之書記述呂尚甚是簡略，《詩經・大雅》稱頌呂氏：

維師尚父，時維鷹揚。涼彼武王，肆伐大商，會朝清明。[25]

「師尚父」爲武王上呂氏的尊號。除此之外，便乏具體的描述。《左傳》僖公二十六年稱他與周公「股肱周室，夾輔成王」[26]。至於呂氏出

22 孔穎達，《禮記正義》(台北：廣文書局，1971)，卷20，頁175。
23 同上，卷12，頁105。
24 歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷15，頁373。
25 高亨注，《詩經今注》(台北：里仁書局，1981)，〈大雅・大明〉，頁374。
26 洪亮吉，《春秋左傳詁》(北京：中華書局，1987)，卷8，頁325。

身，自古即傳言不一[27]；故傳統上書寫呂氏生平最具權威的司馬遷（145B.C.~89B.C.？），在《史記》一書裡便對呂氏的發跡，採數說並陳的方式，可是他於呂氏榮居文、武師，助周滅商的史實，卻篤信不疑。司馬遷讚美周西伯受命爲「文王」：

> 天下三分，其二歸周者，太公之謀計居多[28]。

又說：

> （武王）遷九鼎，修周政，與天下更始。師尚父謀居多[29]。

司馬遷且綜評道：

> 呂尚陰謀修德，以傾商政，其事多兵權與奇計，故後世之言兵及周之陰權皆宗太公為本謀[30]。

要之，司馬遷所塑呂尚的意象，影響後世深遠。唐德宗貞元四年(788)，朝廷爲呂氏祭儀的高低頓起激辯，尙書右司郎中嚴說等人指陳：

---

27 例如《莊子》一書寓言文王觀太公垂釣而重用之。參閱郭慶藩，《莊子集釋》（台北：河洛出版社，1974），〈田子方〉，卷7下，頁720-723；又〈離騷〉謂：「呂望之鼓刀兮，遭周文而得舉」；〈天問〉則謂：「師望在肆，昌何識；鼓刀揚聲，后何喜。」皆見譚介甫，《屈賦新編》（北京：中華書局，1978），《上集》，頁260；《下集》，頁501。《戰國策》中載：「太公望齊之逐夫，朝歌之廢屠。」見何建章，《戰國策注釋》（北京：中華書局，1990），〈秦策五〉，卷7，頁288；《說苑》中亦謂：「太公望故老婦之出夫也，朝歌之屠佐也，棘津迎客之舍人也，年七十相周，九十而封齊。」見盧元駿，《說苑今註今釋》（台灣商務印書館，1977），〈尊賢〉，卷8，頁234。

28 司馬遷，《史記》，卷32，頁1479。

29 同上，卷32，頁1480。

30 同上，卷32，頁1478-1479。

> 貞觀中，以其(太公)兵家之流，始令磻溪立廟；開元中，著上戊釋奠之禮[31]。

他們復評道：

> 太公，兵權奇計之人耳！當殷辛失德，八百諸侯皆歸於周，時維鷹揚以為佐命，在周信有功矣[32]！

嚴氏雖處貶抑太公祀典的陣營，其言說卻不意宣洩太公爲時人所看重的無非是：「善於謀略」及「開國功臣」兩項；此適吻合司馬遷所塑的形象。

援此證諸太公首席陪祀者——張良(？-186B.C.)，亦知非假。依《史記》所述，張氏乃修習《太公兵法》有成，助高祖「運籌策帷帳中，決勝千里外」，滅秦讓項，功勛過人[33]。故唐時致祭武成王的祝文即曰：

> 爰定六韜，載成七德，功業昭著，生靈攸仰[34]。

而致祭留侯的配座文則肯定張氏：

> 宣揚武教，光贊韜鈐，大濟生靈，貽範千載[35]。

31 王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》，卷10，頁14上。
32 同上，卷10，頁13下-14上。
33 司馬遷，《史記》，卷55，頁2035-2049。
34 蕭嵩，《大唐開元禮》，卷55，頁5上。
35 同上，卷55，頁5下。

所以時賢王涇對張良配饗所下的評語，極有見地。他謂：

以留侯配者，以順天殺伐，輔助王室，功業之由同故也[36]。

可見呂尚與張良皆緣「興周」、「旺漢」成為武廟首批奉祀的人選。

特為有趣地，太公之祭自初唐以來成功地嵌入釋奠祀典，後人習焉不察，動輒以亙古常式視之。舉其例：宋人李昉的《太平御覽》，便將此典鑲入《禮記・月令》文句之中。《太平御覽》引述《禮記・月令》，「仲春」條如下：

是月也，命樂正習舞，上丁釋奠於國學，天子及公卿、諸侯、大夫親往視之；命有司上戊釋奠於太公廟[37]。

又「仲秋」條亦云：

是月也，命樂正習吹，上丁釋奠於國學，天子及公卿、諸侯、大夫親往視之；是月也，命有司上戊釋奠於太公廟[38]。

按《禮記・月令》成書於上古，勢無「上丁釋奠於國學」、「上戊釋奠於太公廟」之辭[39]；此處毋乃反映的是唐制實況。衡諸《大唐開元禮》，其中禮文則清楚載有：「仲春、仲秋，上丁釋奠於太學」及「仲

36 王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》，卷10，頁9下-10上。

37 李昉，《太平御覽》(台北：新興書局，1959)，卷535，頁1下。

38 同上，卷535，頁1下。

39 紀昀，《四庫全書總目提要》(台灣商務印書館，文淵閣四庫全書)，卷19，頁1上-1下。並比較孔穎達，《禮記正義》〈月令〉，「仲春」、「仲秋」條。首先發覺此一差異為陶希聖，見氏著〈武廟之政治社會的演變〉，《食貨月刊》，復刊第2卷第5期(1972年8月)，頁3。

春、仲秋，上戊釋奠於齊太公」[40]。覈諸《唐六典》亦同[41]。

另觀諸儀典的發展，太公之祭與孔聖祀典竟呈亦步亦趨的關係。舉其大要：開元八年以前孔廟已有「十哲」之制，開元八年(720)復允「七十二子」配享，開元二十七年(739)追諡孔子爲「文宣王」[42]；相對的，武廟則曾頒發下列的祠令：開元十九年(731)，除以張良配享，且詔「簡取自古名將，功成業著，宏濟生民，准十哲例配享」；惟次年頒佈的《大唐開元禮》，並無致祭十哲之禮，似當時未及施行，故肅宗上元元年(760)詔太公望追封爲「武成王」，並申覆「擇古今名將，準文宣王置亞聖及十哲等。饗祭之典，一同文宣王」[43]，德宗建中三年(782)復勑史館「揀取自古名將充十哲、七十二弟子」[44]。凡此措置，均令武廟祀典日益崢嶸，得與文廟並駕齊驅；但此一趨勢亦令文官集團危疑不安、焦慮叢生，終致群起攻訐武廟祀典，種下武廟日後覆亡的遠因。

二、重文輕武

扼要地說，太公祀典的興立與初唐立國脫不了關係；況且自中唐以降，安史作亂，四夷入侵，中土烽火瀰漫；朝廷用兵方亟之際，武廟祀典自然獲得前所未有的重視。上元元年，太公望追封爲武成王即是例證。其時安史亂起，兩京覆沒，玄宗奔蜀；肅宗繼位，號召勤王，銳意興復。這從其勑封武廟的詔書，可略知梗概。它如是載道：

> 定禍亂者，必先于武德；拯生靈者，諒在師貞。昔周武創業，

40 蕭嵩，《大唐開元禮》(東京：古典研究會，1981)，卷1，頁10下-11上。

41 李林甫，《唐六典》，卷4，頁122。

42 杜佑，《通典》，卷53，頁1481-1482。攸關此一時期孔廟從祀制請參閱拙作〈學術與信仰：論孔廟從祀制與儒家道統意識〉，收入《優入聖域》，頁226-241。

43 杜佑，《通典》，卷53，頁1484。

44 王溥，《唐會要》，卷23，頁435-436。

> 克寧區夏，惟師尚父，實佐興王。況德有可師，義當禁暴，稽諸古昔，爰崇典禮[45]。

字裡行間不無砥礪武將，報效朝廷的用意。所以爾後德宗於建中元年(780)繼位，隨賜號護國元勳郭子儀「尚父」，其來有自[46]。而時論尚謂「將帥之功，莫大於子儀；人臣之位，莫大於尚父。」[47] 可見太公望尊崇的意象非同凡比。

此外，武廟祀典尚有一項前瞻性的做法，爲文廟所不及。原先孔廟固有「十哲」享祭之目，以追祭孔門四科十子[48]；而開元十九年雖詔武廟仿孔門十哲，揀取「自古名將」，配享太公望。惟開元十九年，「十哲」祭儀既未及施行，其細目自無以得解。而上元元年重令揀取「古今名將」仿十哲以享祭，列名者有十，本朝人物則居其二，包括：衛國公李靖和英國公李勣[49]；建中三年獲祀列名「七十二弟子」的古今名將六十四人，本朝人物竟達十位之眾[50]，其中不無寄寓諷厲的深意。反觀文

45 王溥，《唐會要》，卷23，頁435。

46 劉昫，《舊唐書》，卷120，頁3465。

47 同上，卷125，頁3547。

48 文廟的十哲即指孔門四科之俊秀，包括「德行」：顏淵、閔子騫、冉伯牛、仲弓；「言語」：宰我、子貢；「政事」：冉有、季路；「文學」：子游、子夏。這批學生是孔子生前最為得意的及門弟子。因此朝廷特有褒譽。朱熹，《四書章句集注》(北京：中華書局，1983)，《論語集注》，卷6，頁123。

49 武廟「十哲」包括：秦武安君白起、漢淮陰侯韓信、蜀丞相諸葛亮、唐尚書僕射衛國公李靖、司空英國公李勣、漢太子少傅張良、齊大司馬田穰苴、吳將軍孫武、魏西河守吳起、燕昌國君樂毅；以張良配享。見歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷15，頁377。必須一提的，武廟「十哲」幾乎是《唐太宗李衛公問對》一書所囊括殆盡的武學名將。惟秦將白起未受明指，但卷終「忌三世為將」實取自《史記・白起王翦列傳》的典故。參見吳如嵩、王顯臣校注，《李衛公問對校注》與司馬遷，《史記》，卷73，頁2341-2342。

50 唐武將列名「七十二弟子」有王孝恭、尉遲敬德、蘇定方、裴行儉、王孝傑、張仁亶、王晙、郭元振、李光弼、郭子儀等十位。見王溥，《唐會要》，卷23，頁436。而《大唐郊祀錄》則以張齊丘取代李光弼，且少王晙。比較王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》，卷10，頁11上。

廟的「十哲」及「七十二弟子」咸爲孔聖及門弟子，果有其他從祀諸賢亦不出勝朝名儒，蓋文廟迄此仍無本朝人物從祀的先例[51]；故武廟從祀制，「內舉不避親」的當下意識，在在令文官階層難以釋懷。

首起詰難者爲職司朝廷禮儀的太常少卿于休烈。于氏於肅宗乾元元年(758)上疏朝廷，指陳張良不宜配享太公望。他論道：

> 子房(張良)生漢初，佐高祖定天下，時不與太公接。古配食廟廷，皆其佐命；太公，人臣，誼無配享[52]。

他建議移張良配享漢祖廟；朝廷從之，太公遂無配享。其實，于氏的說詞完全反映儒臣的偏見；按該時文廟，孔子雖爲人臣，配食者蓋非爲少數，又名列「二十二賢」的經師(若鄭玄、王肅等等)，絕大數非孔聖同時人。是故，于氏偏袒文廟，至爲顯然。又于氏之疏意外透露開元十九年武廟祠令雖業以「十哲」配享太公，而于氏卻無一語言及「十哲」名目，顯見當時仍未施行。

如前所述，肅宗即位，朝廷用兵方亟；遂追封太公望爲「武成王」，並允擇歷代名將從祀；用以激勵武德。稍後肅宗以歲旱，罷中、小祀，武廟遂亦停祀；可是同列中祀的文宣之祭，至仲秋猶祀之於太學[53]。文宣、武成，孰輕？孰重？不言而喻。

況且朝廷雖頒有上元之制，然而有其制，卻未之行，致武廟祠宇日

51 唐時尚有左丘明等二十二賢(經師)從祀，惟直迄晚唐，始見皮日休為唐儒韓愈入祀孔廟請命，惟此事無有下聞。見皮日休，《皮子文藪》(上海古籍出版社，1981)，卷九，頁88。降至北宋，方得宰輔王安石入祀孔廟，時為宋徽宗崇寧三年(1104)，已晚武廟之制三百多年之久。馬端臨，《文獻通考》(北京：中華書局，1986)，卷44，頁考415。

52 歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷15，頁377。原文見杜佑，《通典》，卷53，頁1483-1484。

53 歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷15，頁376-377。

荒。迄德宗建中年間(780~782)，宰臣盧杞、京兆尹盧甚(慝)以「盧」者，齊之裔，乃鳩集諸姓之族，合錢崇飾，並請朝廷恢復舊典，兼擇自古名將如孔門十哲配饗[54]。是時盧氏權勢方熾，故其議得行[55]。由於武廟禮儀素未完備，例如樂文常襲用文宣王廟樂章[56]；建中三年(782)閏四月，禮儀使顏真卿遂奏：

> 治武成王廟，請如〈月令〉春、秋釋奠。其追封以王，宜用諸侯之數，樂奏軒縣[57]。

此處「樂奏軒縣」需稍加註解，方得聽悉顏氏的「弦外之音」。按「軒縣」爲諸侯之樂，「宮縣」方爲天子之樂，禮固有等差[58]；而文廟於開元二十七年(739)，追贈夫子文宣王時，兩京業已允奏宮縣之樂[59]。迄此，文宣、武成雖同列王位，惟顏氏所定的用樂，不啻刻意貶抑武廟一等。

同年七月，史館奏取「自古名將充十哲、七十二弟子」[60]。武廟祀典一時大有進展，皇朝名將盡享殊榮。惜好景不常，四年之後立遭文臣反對。貞元二年(786)，刑部尚書關播知刪定禮儀，奏請武廟刪去名將配享之儀及十哲之稱，他所持的理由是：

54 李昉，《太平御覽》，卷535，頁4下。
55 王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》，卷10，頁12上。又秦蕙田，《五禮通考》，卷123，頁10下-11上。
56 同上，卷10，頁16下。貞元六年(790)，武廟始有自己的樂文。
57 歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷15，頁377；又王溥，《唐會要》，卷23，頁435。
58 歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷2，頁462-463。
59 杜佑，《通典》，卷53，頁1481-1482。南齊永明三年(485)，朝廷釐定孔廟釋奠禮設軒縣之治。見蕭子顯，《南齊書》(台北：鼎文書局，1980)，卷9，頁144。唐初亦同。
60 王溥，《唐會要》，卷23，頁435-436。

> 太公，古稱大賢，今其下置亞聖，賢之有聖，於義不安。且孔門十哲，皆是當時弟子，今所擇名將，年代不同，於義既乖，於事又失[61]！

析其議，關氏只不過重申乾元元年于休烈的陳見，而朝廷竟允其所請，自是唯享祭武成王及留侯，而諸侯將則不復祭祀[62]。

以上對武廟祀典的壓制皆肇自文臣片面之辭。貞元四年(788)，朝廷則爆發文、武官員集體的論辯，綿延經月之久，規模空前。

屬於文官系統的兵部侍郎——李紓首起發難。他上疏朝廷，以武廟致敬過禮，請依舊式以太常卿以下充三獻，祝版請罷親署之禮[63]，他奏稱：

> 上元元年，(太公望)追贈為武成王，饗祭之典，一同文宣王。……臣以為文宣王垂教，百世宗師，五常三綱，非其訓不明，有國有家，非其制不立，故孟軻稱，有生人以來，一人而已。由是正素王之法，加先聖之名，樂用宮懸，獻差太尉，尊師崇道，雅合正經。且太公述作，止於《六韜》，勳業形於一代，豈可擬其盛德，均其殊禮哉[64]！

李氏擬將武廟祀典削至開元十九年的水平。朝廷遂詔令百寮集議以聞，結果有禮部尚書于頎等四十六人議同李氏。

尤有過之，若干文臣至以「君臣之義」苛責呂尚，藉此降殺武廟的祀典。尚書右司郎中嚴涗等人便採左右夾擊的策略，逼迫太公望去「武

61 同上，卷23，頁436。

62 歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷15，頁378-379。

63 王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》，卷10，頁11上。

64 同上，卷10，頁11下-12上。

成」封號及王位。他們點出呂尙稱王，事出偶然；嚴氏回顧武廟祀典的源起時，說道：

> 貞觀中，以其兵家者流，始令磻溪立廟。開元中，漸著上戊釋奠之禮。其於進寵不為薄矣。上元之際，執事者苟以兵戎之急，遂尊武成王之號，擬議以文宣王，優劣萬殊，不可以訓[65]！

另方面，他們則羅織呂氏有虧臣節的罪名，責備道：

> 當殷辛失德，八百諸侯，皆歸於周，時惟鷹揚，以為佐命，在周有大功矣，於殷謂之何哉[66]？

此一疵議爲刑部員外郎陸淳所承接，並大肆發揮。他非但貶抑呂尙之功止於「救一時之弊」，不可垂訓未來；且坐實呂氏爲殷臣，而慷慨陳言：

> 武成王，殷臣也。見紂之暴，不能諫而佐武王以傾之，於周則社稷之臣矣，於殷謂之何哉？且夫尊其道者，必師其人、必尚其行，使天下之人入是廟也、登是堂也，稽其人可以思見，師其道所由致法，則俾夫立節死義之士，安所措其心乎[67]？

於是陸氏等六位朝臣議循貞觀之制，僅於磻溪一地置祠，令有司以時享奠。這不啻將太公祭祀降爲地方祀典了。

---

65 王溥，《唐會要》，卷23，頁437-438。
66 同上，卷23，頁437。
67 同上，卷23，頁438。

所幸代表武官的左領軍大將軍令狐建等二十四人力爲抗爭，以「兵革未靖，宜右武以起忠烈」爲重[68]，並謂：

> 文、武二教固同，其立廢亦不可異。況其典禮之制，已歷三聖，今欲改之，恐非其宜也[69]。

朝廷最終裁定以「上將軍」以下充武廟獻官，餘依李紓所奏，回歸開元之制[70]。要之，朝廷以「上將軍」(武官)替代「太常卿」(文官)致祭，雖可維護武將的顏面，但「上將軍」秩止「從二品」[71]，較諸上元之制由位列「正一品」的「太尉」領銜致祭，已見遜色；自是武廟愈無法與文廟相頡頏。所以呂氏固得一時保住王位爵稱，卻無法挽回下墜的頹勢。

究其實，唐時武廟祀典的起伏關係文、武勢力的消長，其底蘊卻是機制性的。自唐初，士人文化興起，包括科舉制度的落實，遂使文官晉用步入正軌，易於凝結團體意識[72]；況且制禮作樂原是文官職責所在，策略上便佔盡優勢。例如排擠武廟祀典的于休烈、關播、顏真卿等人便皆是進士出身，且曾賦有制定禮儀的任務[73]。

尤不可忽視地，有唐廟學制的建立，促成文廟祀典、官學教育與科

---

68 歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷15，頁380。

69 王溥，《唐會要》，卷23，頁438。《大唐郊祀錄》與《通典》載「已歷二聖」恐有誤。按上元元年追封太公望為武成王，已歷肅宗、代宗、德宗三朝。比較王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》，卷10，頁16上；杜佑，《通典》，卷53，頁1485。

70 杜佑，《通典》，卷53，頁1485。

71 同上，卷29，頁799。貞元二年：「今十六衛宜各置上將軍一人，秩從二品。」太尉為「正一品」，見劉昫，《舊唐書》，卷42，頁1790。

72 可略參考金諍，《科舉制度與中國文化》(上海：人民出版社，1990)。

73 于、關、顏三氏的生平各見劉昫，《舊唐書》，卷149，頁4007-4009；卷130，頁3627-3629；卷128，頁3589-3597。

考制度三位一體，相互為用。細言之，貞觀四年(630)，太宗下詔州、縣學皆立孔廟；自此中央迄地方，孔廟與學校環環相扣[74]。貞觀二十一年(647)，配享二十二賢(經師)，朝廷褒優的措辭為：「代用其書，重於國胄，自今有用於太學」[75]。顯現從祀諸儒與學校教育密不可分，遑論科考的取材不外乎儒教經典。開元五年(717)，令鄉貢明經、進士見訖，國子監謁先師，學官開講問義[76]；後世尚演變為進士釋褐禮的場所[77]。是故，無論從儀式象徵、價值取向、教育內容、科考利益；文廟在制度上均享有盤根錯節的奧援。

相較之下，武廟則顯得勢單力薄，形影孤離。雖然天寶六年(747)朝廷曾仿文廟之例，詔諸州武舉人上省，先謁太公廟[78]，但武舉、武學與武廟的關係，總不比文廟等。其故存於武舉與武學成效不彰，賡續艱難。則天朝、長安二年(702)敕：「天下諸州，宜教武藝，每年准明經進士貢舉例送。」[79]此一詔令可分兩部分讀之，其一攸關武學，另一則為武舉。觀其文意，朝廷固鼓勵百姓勤習武藝以應舉，卻未設有常置教育機構，故天寶中，方有太學生張鍘上書請於太公廟置武監，與國子監相對，教習胄子，春秋釋奠于先師太公，一如國學文宣王廟。惟下聞卻是：「書寢不報」[80]。視諸當時文人意識高漲之際，張生之議毫無結果，誠屬意料中事。宋、明之時，雖曾重置武學，但間舉間廢，甚不穩

74 歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷15，頁373。李林甫，《唐六典》，卷21，頁557-558。

75 王溥，《唐會要》，卷35，頁636。惟「貞觀三十一年」應作「貞觀二十一年」。

76 歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷44，頁1164。

77 脫脫，《宋史》(台北：鼎文書局，1978)，卷105，頁2553-2554；張廷玉，《明史》(台北：鼎文書局，1979)；龐鍾璐，《文廟祀典考》(台北：中國禮樂學會，1977)，卷5，頁25下。

78 王溥，《唐會要》，卷23，頁436。

79 同上，卷59，頁1030。

80 封演，《封氏聞見記》(叢書集成初編)，卷4，頁49-50

當[81]。

武舉方面，長安之制所試僅限長垜、箭射、馬槍、翹關、負重、身材等臂力體態之事[82]，一無涉及兵學之事，遑論太公之教了。《新唐書・選舉志》謂：「其選用之法不足道，故不復書。」[83]意甚輕蔑。又唐修《登科記》包羅異科出身者甚眾，卻獨軼武舉，其不受重視若此[84]。唐末(僖宗廣明元年，西元880年)有條勅令適可概括有唐武舉的流弊，它說道：

> 入仕之門，兵部最濫，全無根本，頗壞紀綱。近者武官多轉入文官，依資除授，宜懲僭倖，以辨品流[85]。

這種弊端絕非止於唐代，有宋一代重文輕武愈形嚴重；朝廷發覺「諸將子弟皆恥習弓馬，求換文資，數年之後將無人習武」[86]，方汲汲於建立武學以補時弊。然而有宋文舉過於競爭，反有落第太學生循武學、武舉以倖進，逼得朝廷只得同時鎖試武學與文舉，以防進士之被黜而改習者[87]。由此可見，武舉與武學之素質，不啻等而下之了。

---

81 顧炎武，《原抄本日知錄》(台北：明倫出版社，1970)，卷19，頁511-512；沈德符，《萬曆野獲編》(北京：中華書局，1980)，《補遺》，卷3，頁866-867。

82 杜佑，《通典》，卷15，頁354-355。

83 歐陽修，《新唐書》，卷44，頁117。

84 馬端臨，《文獻通考》，卷34，頁考322。唐時武舉，近人論列較詳者有高明士學兄，見氏著〈唐代的武舉與武廟〉，收入中國唐代學會編，《第一屆國際唐代學術會議論文集》(台北：1989)，頁1016-1046。

85 王溥，《唐會要》，卷59，頁1029。

86 馬端臨，《文獻通考》，卷34，頁考323。

87 同上，卷34，頁考323。另《宋史》對該時武舉、武選、武學論述甚詳，從不諱言其流弊。參見脫脫，《宋史》，卷157，頁3679-3686。歐陽修的文集中仍存有武成王廟策問二首，析其文義毫不及軍政或武學，全以儒教經義為依歸。見歐陽修，《歐陽修全集》(台北：世界書局，1961)，卷48，頁325-326。

簡而言之，唐以來武學、武舉積弱不振，令得武廟缺乏持續而有力的制度支撐，其無法與文廟抗衡，甚至趨於式微，實有跡可循。

三、君尊臣卑

若說禮制為價值觀的化身，則武廟的興衰可以一言以蔽之，蓋武廟始自肇制即處於先天不利的氛圍；重文輕武的政治文化非但處處掣肘其發展，往後猶成其覆亡的幫凶。而明朝的創業垂統之君——朱元璋，最終竟緣君尊臣卑的心結，悍然廢置了此一享祀悠久的帝國祀典。

約而述之，唐末迄五代，征伐頻繁，朝廷無暇顧及祠事：朱梁喪亂，武廟廢從祀之祭，後唐明宗有朝臣查覺春秋釋奠僅及文宣王，而武成王廟久曠時祭，方復常祀[88]。迄宋太祖於建隆三年(962)詔修武成王廟與國學相對，乾德二年(964)卻以太公曾追封為武成王，取消配享周文王廟之制[89]。自是，太公只能專祀於武廟。除此之外，有宋一朝，尚有兩樁事值得一書：宋真宗曾追加「昭烈」、「玄聖」於武成王和文宣王；而武廟的光輝莫過於徽宗宣和五年(1123)，朝廷因外侮日亟，復加爵於「十哲」、「七十二將」未有封爵者[90]。可是恰似詩人所描述的：「夕陽無限好，只是近黃昏。」緣武廟已今非昔比，與文廟日形懸隔。其關鍵存於文廟建制得下抵地方州、縣，遍佈天下，而武廟則懸浮京師一隅，連諸州之設亦遭撤消[91]。下抵遼朝則無武成王廟之祭。金人似較重視武廟祀典，至以本朝武臣多人配享太公，惟皇統元年(1141)，熙宗已親詣文宣王廟奠祭，而遲迄章宗泰和六年(1206)始詔建昭烈武成王廟

88 薛居正，《舊五代史》(北京：中華書局，1976)，《唐書》，卷40，頁553。

89 馬端臨，《文獻通考》，卷103，頁考940。

90 脫脫，《宋史》(台北：鼎文書局，1978)，卷105，頁2548-2557。太祖建隆三年(962)，詔修武成王廟，與國學相對。

91 同上，卷98，頁2425。查諸州及州縣均無祭武成王廟。

[92]。降至元朝，武廟尤屈居劣勢，原來蒙元之世，皇帝親遣致祭者有三：曰社稷、曰先農、曰宣聖(文廟)，而武廟獨排於外，既非通祀，且從祀僅及十哲。祭禮甚爲簡略[93]。要之，蒙元武功蓋世，而武廟不受禮遇至此，其衰頹之勢，已毋庸多言。所以明太祖斷然廢置武廟祀典，無非剝奪了武廟倖存的氣息。

簡而言之，武廟的幕啓幕落適反映人君對廟祀的操控，而明太祖廢置武廟殊可彰顯專制君主的心態。按太祖定鼎南京，而該城本無武廟，故大明洪武二十年(1387)，禮部奏請如前代故事，立武學、用武舉，仍祀太公，建昭烈武成王廟。而從該時禮部所請，得以知曉武學、武舉、武廟乃配套措施，缺一則非完法[94]。其時海內初定，典章未備，惟之前禮制包括文廟等已有所因革，迄今方及武廟建制，輕重緩急，可以立判。如所述，武廟存廢繫乎太祖片紙之詔，故以下擬不憚其煩分段徵引，並試加詮釋。

太祖出人意表地竟不假集議，逕駁回禮部所請，充分顯現專制君主的威權。他的裁斷包括主、從兩部分，他開宗明義即說：

> 太公，周之臣封諸侯，若以王祀之，則與周天子並矣。加之非號，必不享也[95]。

太祖於此定下君尊臣卑的基調，而太公王祀之饗爲僭越禮之甚者。此一論點出自人君之口，殊堪留意。

繼而，太祖復以「文武合一」否決建武學、行武舉、別立廟的需

---

92 脫脫，《金史》(台北：鼎文書局，1980)，卷35，頁815-818。
93 宋濂，《元史》(台北：鼎文書局，1980)，卷72，頁1780；卷76，頁1903。
94 黃彰健校，《明實錄》(台北：中央研究院歷史語言研究所)，《太祖實錄》，卷183，頁3。
95 同上，《太祖實錄》，卷183，頁3。

要。他認爲：

> 三代之上，古之學者文武兼備，故措之於用，無所不宜，豈謂文武異科，各求專習者乎？即以太公之鷹揚而授丹書，……豈比於後世武學專講韜略，不事經訓，專習干戈，不閑俎豆，拘於一藝之偏之陋哉！今又欲循舊，用武舉、立廟學，甚無謂也[96]。

按「太公之鷹揚而授丹書」，蓋指太公的武威與政略[97]。太祖彈唱「文武合一」其實只是「君尊臣卑」的修飾符，所以他才會遽下：

> 建武學、用武舉是析文、武為二途，自輕天下無全才矣[98]。

此處的「全才」，若細加推敲，並非獨厚於文官，而是專制君主的自況。之所以獲致如是的答案，則必須釐清太祖意念中，「君尊臣卑」與「文武合一」的糾結。

其實，「文武合一」只是古調「重文輕武」的變奏(variation)，自有其源流。上溯唐世貞元激辯之際，文臣陸淳等人即援古聖人所以勿敬呂氏，以推翻「武成」與「文宣」爲對偶之典。他們如此建言：

> 文武之道非二宗，猶天地有陰陽，時日之有晝夜，相依而立，相須而成；故王者之制因彼此而為伍……暨乎戰國陵夷，王道蕩滅，務於攻取，不顧典刑，遂有孫、吳之略，興起、翦之

96 同上。

97 「鷹揚」已見《詩經》前註。「丹書」則是記載先王為政之道，其事見王聘珍，《大戴禮記解詁》(北京：中華書局，1983)，卷6，頁103-107。

98 黃彰健校：《明實錄》，《太祖實錄》，卷183，頁3。

才，用文武之事，異將相之職，分蓋於此始也[99]。

依上述，上古文武之道原是合一，近世甫分將相之職，所以他們亟欲恢復「將軍即正卿爲之，執大柄即元帥」的制度，這種「出將入相」的主張，即爲後世允文允武的「儒將」理念所本，宋以降尤爲倡行。

宋世重文輕武的基本國策，學者皆有定論[100]；惟其理據卻是文武合一。最典型的言論莫若《資治通鑑》中，司馬光抒發對唐朝興立太公祀典的異見。他評道：

經緯天地之謂文，戡定禍亂之謂武，自古不兼斯二者而稱聖人，未之有也。故黃帝、堯、舜、禹、湯、文、武、伊尹、周公莫不有征伐之功，孔子雖不試，猶能兵萊夷，卻費人，曰「我戰則克」，豈孔子專文而太公專武乎？孔子所以祀於學者，禮有先聖先師故也。自生民以來，未有如孔子者，豈太公得與之抗衡哉[101]！

司馬氏以孔子才兼文武，貶抑太公祀典，此一說帖較昔論以孔子、太公各有所長尤勝一籌；後世當不乏附和者，明儒程敏政即言道：唐立武成王廟以尊禮太公，已失「文武一道」之義[102]。司馬氏的另一個觀點：「先禮義而後勇力」，更可嗅出新時代的意向。他說：

君子有勇而無義為亂，小人有勇而無義為盜；若專訓之以勇力

99 王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》，卷10，頁15上-15下。

100 舉其例以概括其餘若陳登原，《國史舊聞》(台北：明文書局，1984)，《第一分冊》，頁946-954。

101 司馬光，《資治通鑑》(北京：中華書局，1986)，卷213，頁6795-6796。

102 程敏政，《篁墩文集》(台灣商務印書館，文淵閣四庫全書)，卷10，頁15下。

> 而不使之知禮義，奚所不為矣！自孫、吳以降，皆以勇力相勝，狙詐相高，豈足以數於聖賢之門而謂之武哉[103]！

涵泳上下文義即知此處的「君子」與「小人」專就社會階層而言，無關成德與否。司馬氏所爲實藉「勇者害上」、「武以犯禁」的意象聳人聽聞，冀收以文御武的效果；這適反映宋朝治國的精髓。故時人劉敞亦言：武學之設，「恐雖有智者未能善其後」，若「因勳衛子弟不得已而立武學，仍宜以孔子爲先師」，而主張罷祀太公[104]。換言之，以孔子兼文武聖的論調絕非宋世文官的專利，下抵明世尚見武學掌教者，亟於武學內改建文廟[105]。清臣尤不落人後慷慨陳言：「孔廟外，另立武成王廟，此最不學無識者之所爲。」[106]可見以文御武不時浮現於統治階層的思慮之中。

傳統社會，「國之大事，唯祀與戎」[107]，惟「兵者乃不祥之器」[108]，故武人動輒招致猜忌。不止武廟祀典屢受壓制，連武舉、武學的成效亦受質疑。若武舉雖起於唐世，貞元年間卻爲防範應考者「挾持弓矢，出入皇城」，一度停試十年之久[109]。又宋仁宗慶曆三年(1043)，詔置武學于武成王廟，旋罷廢，以議者言：

> 古名將如諸葛亮、羊祜、杜預等，豈專學孫、吳[110]？

103 司馬光，《資治通鑑》，卷213，頁6795-6796。
104 轉引自顧炎武：《日知錄》，卷19，頁513。
105 同上，卷19，頁513。
106 方觀承之言載秦蕙田的《五禮通考》，卷123，頁31下。
107 洪亮吉，《春秋左傳詁》(北京：中華書局，1987)，卷11，頁467。
108 高亨，《老子正詁》(上海：開明書店，1948)，頁72。
109 王溥，《唐會要》，卷59，頁1030-1031。
110 脫脫，《宋史》，卷165，頁3915。

議者究竟爲何人，史無記載，但所舉三人則悉爲世人所標榜的儒將。依議者之見，三者功業顯非孫武、吳起兵略所能範圍。所謂儒將則必須先仁義(文教)，後勇力(武略)方得符合允文允武的至高標準[111]。所以秦將白起雖戰功顯赫，而樂殺無辜，即遭宋太祖所罷祀[112]。必得分辨地，「文武合一」的真諦在以文治武，非以武就文，骨子裡仍不脫以文御武的窠臼。《宋史·太祖本紀》裡載有一段意味深長的對話，最能道出此中真相：

> 上謂侍臣曰：「朕欲武臣盡讀書以通治道，何如？」左右不知所對[113]。

太祖史稱「大重儒者」，且立下「作相須讀書人」的傳世典則[114]，而群臣猶患無詞以對，其所思若借用宋臣文彥博的名言，毋乃是人君「爲與士大夫治天下，非與百姓治天下。」[115]而武臣雖爲命官，尚不足上躋士大夫之列，此正是難言之隱。

職是之故，神宗熙寧五年(1072)，朝廷雖允重置武學，除規定諸生勤習諸家兵法，且得訓知「前世忠義之節」[116]。武人的忠誠度尤爲關心所在。但此並不足以祛除文人的疑忌，明季既屋，顧炎武即意有所指地論道：「(有宋)靖康之變，不聞武學有禦侮者。」[117] 同遭亡國之痛的黃宗羲則逕指出：明末建義於郡縣者，皆文臣與儒生，與毅宗從死者

---

111 參較劉子健，〈從儒教的概念說到歷史上對南宋初張浚的評論〉，收入楊聯陞、全漢昇、劉廣京主編，《國史釋論》(台北：食貨出版社，1988)，下冊，頁481-485。

112 脫脫：《宋史》，卷105，頁2556。

113 同上，卷1，頁11。

114 同上，卷3，頁50。

115 李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》(上海古籍出版社，1986)，卷221，頁4上。

116 馬端臨，《文獻通考》，卷34，頁考322。

117 顧炎武，《原抄本日知錄》，卷19，頁512。

亦皆文臣；武人之為大帥，不止不敢當敵，且乘時易幟；遂痛陳文武不得合一的弊病[118]。上視蒙元亡宋，此語似亦有據。元世祖質問宋將「何降之易」，彼竟答曰：

> 宋有強臣賈似道擅國柄，每優禮文士，而獨輕武官。臣等久積不平，心離體解，所以望風而送款也[119]。

其實「重文輕武」乃宋朝一貫的基本國策，非獨賈似道為然；若職掌軍政的樞密使幾乎盡是文官，進士出身尤佔百分之八十[120]。有趣的是，元世祖毫不接受南宋降將的辯解，反認為彼有以致之[121]。而終蒙元一朝，朝廷竟廢武舉與武學[122]，故明初朝臣遂有重設之請。

迥出意料，明太祖不但拒絕朝臣所請，且罷太公舊廟，去其王號，止宜從祀帝王廟[123]。至此，帝國釋奠禮復歸於一，由孔聖文廟專享。然而太祖所以廢武廟，並非如儒生自我抬愛，若清初禮學名家秦蕙田即謂太祖廢武廟，因「太公之功焉得與孔子並」，至譽太祖之舉「可破千年黷祀之典」[124]；而傳統史家尤不落於人後論道：

> (太公之祀)明太祖毅然罷之，一代變禮之善者，此其最也[125]。

118 黃宗羲，《明夷待訪錄》收入《黃宗羲全集》(杭州：浙江古籍出版社，1985)，第一冊，頁33-35。

119 宋濂，《元史》，卷9，頁180。

120 前引文劉子健，〈從儒將的概念說到歷史上對南宋初張浚的評論〉，頁484。又氏著〈略論宋代武官群在統治階級中的地位〉，收入劉子健，《兩宋史研究彙編》(台北：聯經出版公司，1987)，頁173-184。

121 宋濂，《元史》，卷9，頁180。

122 同上，卷81，頁2027-2036。「學校」已無武學記述。另見趙翼，《陔餘叢考》(上海：商務印書館，1957)，卷28，頁592-593。

123 黃彰健校，《明實錄》，《太祖實錄》，卷183，頁3上。

124 秦蕙田，《五禮通考》，卷120，頁11上。

125 夏燮，《明通鑑》(北京：中華書局，1959)，卷9，頁455。

又顧炎武特讚許太祖的裁決致「文事武備統歸於一，嗚呼純矣！」[126] 凡此溢美之辭，均是不解當時實情所致。

首先，明太祖並非不知太公望的重要性，他曾勤研且口釋黃石公《三略》，謂爲「用兵攻取，時務所先」[127]。按《三略》乃《太公兵法》[128]，實太祖馬上得天下的利器；而事過境遷，太公祀典遭此下場。這就需從專制君主的心態忖之，方可得解。

國初承異族蒙元之後，明太祖屢詔諸臣大修禮事；參預者雖眾，其基本精神卻本諸太祖[129]。太祖對君尊臣卑的執著，在祭祀禮儀表現得淋漓盡致。洪武二十一年(1388)，適逢太公改從祀歷代帝王廟[130]，太祖在殿試制策中明白宣示了他制禮的立場。他說：

> 事神之道，志人之心，莫不同焉。雖然始古至今，凡所祀事必因所以而乃祀焉。然聖賢之制，禮有等殺。自天子至於臣民，祭祀之名，分限之定，其來遠矣[131]。

「祭祀之名，分限之定」是太祖所堅持的，而洪武三年(1370)下詔革去諸神封號[132]，洪武二十年復除太公望王封，均是太祖此一理念的反映。

作爲創業之君，明太祖格外重視祀典的釐定。洪武元年(1368)，他即開示修禮諸臣道：

126 顧炎武，《原抄本日知錄》，卷19，頁512。
127 鄧士龍，《國朝典故》(北京：北京大學出版社，1993)，卷5，頁116。
128 參見司馬遷，《史記》，卷55，頁2035，2048-2049；又吳如嵩、王顯臣，《李衛公問對校注》，頁18。
129 黃彰健校，《明實錄》，《太祖實錄》，卷30，頁1上-4下；卷38，頁1上-10上。
130 張廷玉，《明史》(台北：鼎文書局，1980)，卷50，頁1293；夏燮，《明通鑑》，卷9，頁455。
131 黃彰健校，《明實錄》，《太祖實錄》，卷189，頁1上。
132 張廷玉，《明史》，卷50，頁1306。

自昔聖帝明王之有天下，莫嚴於祭祀，故當有事，內必致其誠敬，外必備其儀文，所以交神明也[133]。

鑑於有元失馭，以致聲教分歧，他相信欲底定華夷大統，則「爲治之道，必本於禮」[134]，而祀典乃禮之大宗。他在洪武三年裁示去除山川諸神封號時，說道：

夫禮，所以明神人，正名分，不可僭差。自今悉依古制，凡嶽、鎮、海、瀆之神，並去前代所封名號，止以山水本名稱其神。郡縣城隍神號一體改正，歷代忠臣烈士亦依當時初封以為實號，後世溢美之稱，皆與革去[135]。

按自唐世，山川之神，崇名美稱，歷代有加，稱「帝」、稱「王」，比比皆是。依太祖之意，不止人倫，且祭神都需恪守名分之際，不得僭差。太祖自稱此番整飭「庶幾神人之際，名正言順，於此爲當。」[136]而此次倖免除封則獨有「文宣」、「武成」二王。

洪武三年之詔於孔子保有王封，曾有清楚的交代；蓋太祖以爲「惟孔子善明先王之要道，爲天下師以濟後世，非有功於一方一時者可比」，故「所有封爵，宜仍其舊」[137]。觀其語意，似特別尊崇孔聖，其實則不然。之前，太祖因與聖裔(曲阜孔家)心生嫌隙[138]，忽於洪武二年(1369)下令孔廟春秋釋奠止行於曲阜，天下及京師不必通祀[139]。

---

133 黃彰健校，《明實錄》，《太祖實錄》，卷30，頁1上。
134 同上，卷53，頁1下。
135 同上，卷53，頁1下。
136 同上，卷53，頁1上-1下。
137 同上，卷53，頁1下。
138 此一分析請參閱拙文〈道統與治統之間〉，收入《優入聖域》，頁148-151。
139 徐一夔，《大明集禮》(台灣商務印書館，文淵閣四庫全書)，卷16，頁20上。

復嘗讀《孟子》，怪孟氏與時君語多不遜，令罷祀孟子配享，且詔有諫者以大不敬論[140]。此無異貶損士人所信仰的道統，遂招致儒臣莫大的反彈。刑部尚書錢唐即抗命入諫道：「臣為孟軻死，死有餘榮。」史書載「帝鑒其誠懇，不之罪。」[141]其實錢唐所體現的殉道行為，代表了政治權威與文化信仰正面的衝突，而其代價正是統治者難以評估的；尤值建國之初，正需儒臣效力，故太祖一時凜於清議，旋復孟子配享，而卒修《孟子節文》以顧全體面[142]。同理，孔子雖於洪武二年停止通祀，但已引起群臣抗爭，故洪武三年太祖諒不致輕舉妄動，而特允孔聖保留王封，惟遲迄洪武十五年孔子方得恢復天下通祀[143]。

總之，太祖的妥協無非避免激化與文臣緊張的狀態。反觀太公望則無此幸運。原來洪武三年，太祖定都的南京並無武成王之祀，以致太公僥倖逃過一劫。洪武二十年，朝臣不假思索逕提斯議，則不啻自投羅網了。所以太公望去王封，實可得解。但明太祖為何非罷廟而後止呢？這就需考慮與其他祀典的互動了。

以今觀古，逆知太公望以從祀歷代帝王廟為結局，因此後者必是解謎之鑰。明初沿襲元制，祀典中唯社稷、三皇與孔子通祀[144]。其中，

---

140 《明史》之〈太祖本紀〉或〈禮志〉皆不載洪武二年令孔子釋奠止於曲阜，罷京師及天下通祀。《明實錄》亦然。蓋後世史臣為太祖隱諱。此一資料惟見於《明史》，〈錢唐傳〉見《明史》，卷139，頁3981。又談遷，《國榷》(上海古籍出版社，1958)，卷3，頁385。談氏刻意引述《寧波府志》關於洪武二年停孔子天下通祀的記載，方下此一啼笑皆非的案語：「按高皇帝最尚儒術，安有罷祀之理。故特記之。」

141 張廷玉，《明史》，卷50，頁1296；卷139，頁3982。《明史》繫是事於五年。因錢唐卒於洪武四年，全祖望考訂應為二年，李之藻則繫於洪武三年，各見全祖望，《結埼亭集》(上海商務印書館，四部叢刊初編)，卷35，頁371；李之藻，《頖宮禮樂疏》(台灣商務印書館，文淵閣四庫全書)，卷2，頁15下。

142 張廷玉，《明史》，卷139，頁3982。攸關《孟子節文》，近人的著作可參考容肇祖，〈明太祖的《孟子節文》〉，收入氏著《容肇祖集》(濟南：齊魯書社，1989)，頁170-183。

143 黃彰健校，《明實錄》，《太祖實錄》，卷144，頁2上。

144 張廷玉，《明史》，卷50，頁1294。

蒙元創制三皇通祀。依照元制，「三皇」乃伏羲、神農與軒轅三氏；元貞元年(1295)，成宗初命郡縣通祀，一如宣聖釋奠禮，而以醫師主之[145]。武宗至大二年(1309)，復詔三皇配位依文廟從祀禮[146]。可見三皇祀典實取法自孔聖廟祀。洪武四年(1371)，太祖突發奇想「三皇繼天立極，以開萬世教化之源，而汩於醫師」，以爲非禮；遂命天下郡邑毋得褻祀[147]。不意卻矮化三皇祭典，於是洪武六年(1373)，太祖特立廟於京師，合祭三皇與歷代帝王。廟成且親臨致祭，禮敬過之，蓋欲躬承治統的尊榮，明示帝王之尊非地方所得褻祀[148]。宋訥在〈勅建歷代帝王廟碑〉即將此一底蘊，和盤托出。他寫道：

> 欽惟聖天子受天明命，肇修人紀，以建民極。纘皇帝王之正統，衍億萬年之洪基，稽古定制，作廟京邑以祀歷代帝王，重一統也[149]。

宋氏並稱許太祖定鼎江左以來，屢修祀事爲「正名定統」之舉[150]。

既存有一此象徵治統的祀典，則太公自無別樹一幟爲武者宗主的餘地，其撤廟只是機緣的問題。其故無它：明太祖以布衣起義，原藉武力取得天下，深諳「兵能弭亂，亦能召亂」的道理[151]。於承平之時，勢必嚴控武人的忠誠度，斷不容武者別有其他精神依歸；因此在去王封及

145 宋濂，《元史》，卷76，頁1902。
146 紀昀，《續文獻通考》(台灣商務印書館，1987)，卷85，頁考3549。
147 黃彰健校，《明實錄》，《太祖實錄》，卷63，頁3下。
148 申時行，《明會典》(北京：中華書局，1988)，卷91，頁517。明世宗的權臣張璁亦印證道：「有人於此列堯舜禹湯文武之像而祀之，其罹刑禁也，必矣。」張璁，《論對錄》(萬曆三十五年，中央研究院傅斯年圖書館珍藏)，卷六，頁28下。
149 宋訥，《西隱文稿》(台北：文海出版社，1970)，卷7，頁11上。
150 同上，卷七，頁11下。
151 黃彰健校，《明實錄》，《太祖實錄》，卷186，頁1下。

撤廟之後，隔年隨裁定太公與歷代名臣計三十七位，咸從祀歷代帝王廟[152]。至此，太公已無自處之地，僅得臣服於治統之元，而爲武者表率。

四、餘論

自明太祖罷祀武成廟之後，帝國祀典獨缺武者專祀，致古今名將一時無所依歸；故萬曆十二年(1584)，神宗大感不解，遂詢問內閣文臣：「從祀乃何不及武臣？」閣臣則敷衍道：

> 武臣從祀于太廟，所以彰武功；儒臣從祀于孔廟，所以表文治[153]。

按「太廟」旨在致祭本朝先祖，和「歷代帝王廟」同爲治統所繫。既以武功屬之太廟，則太公望不得與之抗衡，本人復非皇朝功臣，只得永遠寄寓於歷代帝王廟了[154]。其恢復主祀的機會愈爲渺茫。

明太祖素被視爲「傳統政治復興下的君主獨裁」[155]，作爲創業重統之

152 同上，卷188，頁5下-6上。

153 黃彰健校，《明實錄》，《神宗實錄》，卷155，頁5上。

154 嘉靖十五年(1536)四月，兵部官員奏請：「古今言兵者，以太公呂望為宗，請倣唐制立武成王廟。」皇上從之，即命兵工二部擬議圖說以聞。此事見《世宗實錄》，卷186，頁4上-4下；又沈德符的《萬曆野獲編》亦刊載此事，見氏著《萬曆野獲編》(北京：中華書局，1980)，《補遺》，卷3，頁866-867。惟此事恐未及實行，故萬曆十二年(1584)方有此問。下迄清季，應設有武廟主祀武成王，例如：直隸宣化總兵官李如炌的奏疏中，述及「臣見武廟中，正位則武成王，而關帝或於四配同侍，或於兩廡列坐。」見雍正：《硃批諭旨》(台北：文源書局，1965)，頁11上。惟《清史稿》及《清會典》均僅著錄太公望從祀帝王廟，官方祀典並無主祀太公望的記載。

155 錢穆稱明太祖所建立的新政權為「傳統政治復興下的君主獨裁」，參見錢穆，《國史大綱》(台灣商務印書館，1964)，第36、37章。明太祖專制思想著於義理層面始見余英時師的〈唐、宋、明三帝老子注中之治術發微〉收入氏著，《歷史與思想》(台北：聯經出版公司，1976)，頁77-86。

君，他亟思集文治、武功於一身；援其罷祀武廟的門面之詞而言，則是「文武全才」的化身。他於底定中原之後，非但大肆調整軍、政架構，俾便親執天子權柄，亦將此一心態延伸於制禮作樂之上；所以明初禮制的變革，處處留下他個人意旨的烙印，武成王廟之廢祀即是太祖自詡的傑作。

七十多年前，韋伯(Max Weber, 1864-1920)在論中國宗教時曾說過：傳統中國的農業經濟型態亟需穩定的壓力，致使武神(war gods)無法攀上奧林匹克的巔峰(Olympian heights)。皇帝變成農夫的守護者，而非黷武的君主，共治的士大夫輒傾向熙寧的文治[156]。韋伯的論點迄今看來猶極有見地。但他未曾觀察到的是，帝制晚期的君主獨裁竟將武廟之祀連根拔除，使得歷代名將頓成孤魂野鬼，飄泊終日；獨有例外的便是關羽與岳飛，二者自立門戶，聲勢遠軼已故的祀典。

按蜀前將軍——關羽，唐中葉方忝列武成王廟「七十二將」[157]，岳飛則是遲迄南宋的抗金名將，二者皆殉難完節，以忠孝仁義著稱[158]；冥然契合後世所標舉的「仁義之將」、「節制之師」的標準[159]。宋世以降，二人聲勢鵲起；明初廢武成王廟之後，關、岳或分祀、或合祀，香火鼎盛，繼又崇為武廟與孔廟並峙[160]。惟此與原初主祀太公武廟的本旨已漸行漸遠。

下抵明、清，關廟特為人所膜拜[161]，上位者取其「護國」，下焉

---

156 Max Weber, *The Religion of China*, trans. and ed. By Hans H. Gerth(New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964), PP. 24-25.

157 王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》，卷10，頁10下。

158 關羽、岳飛事蹟略見陳壽，《三國志》(台北，鼎文書局，1983)，卷36，頁939-942；脫脫，《宋史》，卷365，頁11375-11395。羅貫中的《三國演義》對塑造關公形象的影響尤為深遠。

159 程敏政，《篁墩文集》，卷10，頁16下-17上。

160 北宋大觀二年(1108)，關羽已晉封「武安王」；岳飛則在南宋嘉定四年(1211)，追封鄂王。各見趙翼，《陔餘叢考》，卷35，頁756-757。又脫脫，《宋史》，卷365，頁11395。

161 京師關廟於明永樂中始載祀典，見孫承澤，《春明夢餘錄》(北京古籍出版社，1992)，卷22，頁318。

者求其「保民」[162]，各有所屬，與民生利用融成一片。除官方爲其所立之廟以外，關廟且深入民間各個角落，成爲市井商肆及升斗小民私祭的對象[163]。與其望衡對宇的孔廟卻顯得冷冷清清：除春秋二仲，由官員和士子致祭，平時門可羅雀，祭時民眾亦不得參預[164]；而關廟熙來攘往，終年香煙繚繞，官式祭祀之外，四方信眾不時參拜。如是觀之，明初武廟固毀於一旦，未嘗非失之東隅，收之桑榆。

尤爲嘲諷地，洪武初年，吳沈上〈孔子封王辯〉，謂：王者，君之號；夫子，人臣，死則不得僭稱爲王[165]。此一建議，由於太祖尚心存顧忌，不及貿然採行，而後卻加諸缺乏文官奧援的太公祀典。然而，嘉靖九年(1530)，世宗以改制孔廟爲口實，打擊文官集團，他竟援太公望去王封的先例，削爵孔聖。他冠冕堂皇地說：

> 孔子本臣於周，與太公望無異。所傳之道，本義、農之傳，但賴大明之耳[166]。

至此，孔聖王封亦不保。文、武雙聖咸爲歸零，而專制政權則趨於嫻熟

---

162 例如咸豐二年加封關帝「護國」，隔年復加封「保民」，見趙爾巽，《清史稿》(北京：中華書局，1998)，卷84，頁2541。

163 黃華，《關公的人格與神格》(台灣商務印書館，1967)，頁6-7；又陶希聖，〈武廟之政治與社會演變〉，頁8-9；Prasenjit Duara, "Superscribing Symbols: The Myth of Guandi, Chinese God of War", *The Journal of Asian Studies* 47, No. 4(November 1988)，778-795. 關帝的信仰甚至與秘密社會的結社有關聯，參看莊吉發，〈從薩攀信仰及秘密會黨的盛行分析清代關帝崇拜的普及〉，收入傅飛嵐、林富士編，《遺跡崇拜與聖者崇拜》(台北：允晨文化公司，2000)，頁203-231。

164 請參閱拙作〈孔廟的解構與重組：轉化傳統文化所衍生的困境〉，收入《優入聖域》，頁313-325。

165 吳沈，〈孔子封王辯〉，收入黃訓，《皇朝名臣經濟錄》(台北：學海出版社，1984)，卷12，頁32下-37上。

166 黃彰健校，《明實錄》，《世宗實錄》，卷199，頁8上。

自信，無所匹敵。

引用書目

中文部分

孔穎達，《禮記正義》（台北：廣文書局，1971）。
王涇，《大唐郊祀錄》（上海古籍出版社，續修四庫全書）。
王國維校，《水經注箋》（上海人民出版社，1984）。
王溥，《唐會要》（台北：世界書局，1960）。
王聘珍，《大戴禮記解詁》（北京：中華書局，1983）。
司馬光，《資治通鑑》（北京：中華書局，1986）。
司馬遷，《史記》（台北：泰順書局，1971）。
申時行，《明會典》（北京：中華書局，1988）。
皮日休，《皮子文藪》（上海古籍出版社，1981）。
全祖望，《鮚埼亭集》（上海商務印書館，四部叢刊初編）。
朱熹，《四書章句集注》（北京：中華書局，1983）。
何建章，《戰國策注釋》（北京：中華書局，1990）。
余英時，《歷史與思想》（台北：聯經出版社，1976）。
吳如嵩、王顯臣校注，《唐太宗李衛公問對校注》（北京：中華書局，1983）。
宋訥，《西隱文稿》（台北：文海出版社，1970）。
宋濂，《元史》（台北：鼎文書局，1980）。
李之藻，《頖宮禮樂疏》（台灣商務印書館，文淵閣四庫全書）。
李林甫，《唐六典》（北京：中華書局，1992）。
李昉，《太平御覽》（台北：新興書局，1959）。
李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》（上海古籍出版社，1986）。
杜佑，《通典》（北京：中華書局，1988）。
沈德符，《萬曆野獲編》（北京：中華書局，1980）。
金諍，《科舉制度與中國文化》（上海：人民出版社，1990）。

封演，《封氏聞見記》(叢書集成初編)。
洪亮吉，《春秋左傳詁》(北京：中華書局，1987)。
紀昀，《四庫全書總目提要》(台灣商務印書館，文淵閣四庫全書)。
——，《續文獻通考》(台灣商務印書館，1987)。
夏燮，《明通鑑》(北京：中華書局，1959)。
孫希旦，《禮記集解》(北京：中華書局，1989)。
孫承澤，《春明夢餘錄》(北京古籍出版社，1992)。
容肇祖，《容肇祖集》(濟南：齊魯書社，1989)。
徐一夔，《大明集禮》(台灣商務印書館，文淵閣四庫全書)。
秦蕙田，《五禮通考》(桃園：聖環圖書公司，1994)。
馬端臨，《文獻通考》(北京：中華書局，1986)。
高亨，《老子正詁》(上海：開明書店，1948)。
——注，《詩經今注》(台北：里仁書局，1981)。
高明士，〈唐代的武舉與武廟〉，收入中國唐代學會編：《第一屆國際唐代學術會議論文集》(台北：1989)。
張廷玉，《明史》(台北：鼎文書局，1979)。
張璁，《諭對錄》(萬曆三十五年，中央研究院傅斯年圖書館珍藏)。
脫脫，《宋史》(台北：鼎文書局，1978)。
——，《金史》(台北：鼎文書局，1980)。
郭慶藩，《莊子集解》(台北：河洛出版社，1974)。
陳登原，《國史舊聞》(台北：明文書局，1984)。
陳壽，《三國志》(台北：鼎文書局，1983)。
陶希聖，〈武廟之政治社會的演變〉，《食貨月刊》，復刊第二卷，第五期(1972年8月)。
傅飛嵐、林富士編，《遺跡崇拜與聖者崇拜》(台北：允晨文化公司，2000)。
彭叔夏，《文苑英華》(台北：華文書局，1967)。
程敏政，《篁墩文集》(台灣商務印書館，文淵閣四庫全書)。
黃宗羲，《明夷待訪錄》收入《黃宗羲全集》(杭州：浙江古籍出版社，1985)。
黃訓，《皇朝名臣經濟錄》(台北：學海出版社，1984)。

黃華，《關公的人格與神格》（台灣商務印書館，1967）。
黃進興，《優入聖域》（台北：允晨文化公司，1994）。
黃彰健校，《明實錄》（台北：中央研究院歷史語言研究所）
雍正，《硃批諭旨》（台北：文源書局，1965）。
趙爾巽，《清史稿》（北京：中華書局，1998）。
趙翼，《陔餘叢考》（台北：世界書局，1960）。
劉子健，〈從儒教的概念說到歷史上對南宋初張浚的評論〉，收入楊聯陞、全漢昇、劉廣京主編：《國史釋衡》（台北：食貨出版社，1988）。
———，《兩宋史研究彙編》（台北：聯經出版公司，1987）。
劉昫，《舊唐書》（台北：鼎文書局，1979）。
歐陽修，《新唐書》（台北：鼎文書局，1979）。
談遷，《國榷》（上海古籍出版社，1958）。
鄧士龍，《國朝典故》（北京：北京大學出版社，1993）。
盧元駿，《說苑今註今釋》（台灣商務印書館，1977）。
蕭嵩，《大唐開元禮》（東京：古典研究會，1981）。
錢穆，《國史大綱》（台灣商務印書館，1964）。
薛居正，《舊五代史》（北京：中華書局，1976）。
魏收，《魏書》（台北：鼎文書局，1980）。
龐鍾璐，《文廟祀典考》（台北：中國禮樂學會，1977）。
譚介甫，《屈賦新編》（北京：中華書局，1978）。
顧炎武，《原抄本日知錄》（台北：明倫出版社，1970）。

英文部分

Prasenjit Duara, "Superscribing Symbols: The Myth of Guandi, Chinese God of War", *The Journal of Asian Studies* 47, no.4(November 1988), 778-795.
D. L. McMullen, "The Cult of Ch'i Tai-Kung and T'ang Attitude to the Military", *T'ang Studies* 7(1989).
Max Weber, *The Religion of China*, trans. and ed. By Hans H. Gerth(New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964).

北宋積貧新解

——試論「國用不足」與王安石新法之爭*

冀小斌

美國Rutgers大學Camden分校歷史系助教授

在二十世紀的宋史研究中，王安石變法是一個相當重要的題目。而許多學者在分析王安石變法時，似乎已經形成了一個固定的說法，即變法是爲了解決北宋積貧積弱的問題[1]。這一點，甚至對變法持負面評價的學者也不否認[2]。這種說法從王安石和其他改革派的角度看，是完全順理成章的：朝廷缺錢，所以要開財源：國家要備戰，所以要積攢軍費，實行將兵法、保甲法。但從保守派的角度看，此說卻引出了新的問

* 首先，我想在此感謝余老師十多年教誨之恩。假如沒有余老師的教導，我今天會是完全另外一個人。本文初稿在會上報告後，Willard Peterson老師提出了實貴的問題。我雖無力在本文中作出圓滿的答覆，但仍從問題中得到啓發，進一步明確了下一步研究的方向。在本文寫作過程中，陸揚學長不但多次和我討論本文的論點，而且為我指出了幾點材料上的不足。我謹在此表示感謝。

1 這並不是說，學者都認為解脫困境是變法的唯一目的。而是說學者在討論變法的其他目的時，一般仍不忘積貧積弱的老命題。例如，鄧廣銘老先生對王安石的晚年定論，就比較強調王安石發展生產、恢復漢唐舊疆的雄心壯志。但鄧先生仍然認為解決積貧積弱的問題是變法雄圖的一部分。見鄧廣銘，《北宋政治改革家王安石》(北京：人民出版社，1997)，特別是頁110、111、279。

2 例如，王曾瑜，〈王安石變法簡論〉，《中國社會科學》1980年第3期，頁132。

題。如果說保守派因爲反戰而不願在軍事上花太多資源還是說得通的；但他們爲什麼並不太急於扭轉積貧的局面呢？(按：神宗初年的司馬光雖然呼籲減省政府開支，卻沒有大肆精簡的急迫感。)要回答這個問題，就需要重新分析北宋中期積貧的性質以及積貧與當時政治的關係。

本文擬提出以下論點：一、王安石變法以前，北宋政府已經形成了一套解決經費短缺的方法，即用皇帝私財(主要是內藏庫)補政府經費之不足。政府既然需要內帑的資助，則當時所謂「國用不足」在這個意義上確是實情。但正因爲有了內帑的資助，所以這種「不足」(亦即「積貧」)並非迫在眉睫、關乎國家生死存亡的問題。二、爲了達到政治上的某些目的，北宋君臣有時會誇張各種資金不足的嚴重性。而正因爲積貧可被用來支持某些政策和政治立場，所以嘴上大喊「國用不足」的人在行動上未必真的都急於解決這個問題。

現代學術，雖然重視超乎政治的客觀研究，但二十世紀對王安石新法的研究卻是自始就與現實政治環境息息相關的。日本學者柳田節子指出，從南宋到清代，學者一般認爲王安石變法是錯誤的。二十世紀把王安石當成改革英雄的風尚，實自梁啓超始。而梁推崇王，又與梁本身參加百日維新的經驗有關[3]。按余老師的分析，二十世紀中國知識界有一個越來越激進的過程。在這個大環境下，先有困境再有變法英雄設法突出困境的公式，就對受此環境影響的學者有極大的吸引

3 柳田節子，〈一九七〇年代の中國における王安石評價をめぐつて〉，收入柳田氏之《宋元社會經濟史研究》(東京：創文社，1995)。對王安石持正面評價的漆俠和郭旭東，也說「自南宋初年以後，王安石以及王安石變法的檔案上，就蒙上了趙構及其御用史官們撒下的一層汙塵。直到本世紀二十年代，梁啓超的《王荊公傳》，纔一掃趙構們的汙塵，為王安石、王安石變法翻了案，從而突破了封建主義的樊籬。」見漆、郭兩先生的〈關於王安石變法研究中的幾個問題〉，《中國史研究》，1989年第4期，頁32。

力[4]。

1980年代以後，雖然宋史界不再向王安石一面倒，但改革是因爲積貧積弱的基本命題似乎並未作徹底的重新探討。筆者本不以財政史見長，這次自不量力地標新立異，主要是因爲筆者在研究司馬光時，遇到一個非解決不可的問題：在反新法的「保守派」中，不乏博學深思之士。而這些人對朝廷的忠心，好像並不亞於改革派。他們反對大改，說明當時的現狀對他們來說應該基本上可以接受。但國用不足怎麼是可以接受的呢[5]？

從北宋群臣的奏議來看，好像到了神宗初年，「國用不足」已經非常嚴重。但仔細分析，似乎又未必如此。例如，司馬光在仁宗嘉祐七年(1062年)七月的《論財利疏》中，就說當時「公私之積素不充實，若遇饑饉，將無以相恤」[6]。到了神宗剛即位幾個月的治平四年(1067年)八

---

4 「改革」這個詞對現代人的誘惑，有時會令人陷入自相矛盾之中而不自知。百日維新和王安石變法都包含有增強政府力量的目標，所以梁啓超推崇王安石是有道理的。但筆者曾遇到一位官員，他一面支持大陸的改革開放，一面推崇王安石的改革，認為值得效法，這就比較費解了。因為在政府干涉經濟的問題上，兩種改革是背道而馳的。其實改革不過是改變現狀的意思，而現狀不但可以改好，而且可以改壞。現代人易犯的毛病，是看見「改革」、「變法」的字眼，就先存了先入為主的好感。

5 程民生認為，北宋所謂的「積貧」，並非政府整體的經費不足，而是各部門間流通不靈造成的局部短缺。所以北宋的財政問題，與其說是「積貧」，不如說是「積弊」。王安石變法的缺點，在於增加了政府的財源，卻沒有解決財政管理的協調問題。見程民生，〈論北宋財政的特點與積貧的假象〉，《中國史研究》1984年第3期，頁26-40。程文涵蓋面甚廣，主旨在於全面討論北宋財政，而非專門講王安石變法。因此程文對「積貧」與變法的關係未及細論。或許因為程文的側重不在變法，就筆者所知，在王安石研究中，程先生的論點並未得到應有的注意。關於變法以前宋代財政的討論，拙作與程文的出發點有所不同：程文側重於積弊的分析，拙作則在承認一定的積弊的前提下分析何以有許多人覺得這種積弊是可以接受的。筆者讀到程文時，拙作已基本成形。對程先生成果利用及回應不夠之處，望讀者見諒。Paul Smith先生是第一位提示筆者應該讀程文的人，筆者謹在此表示謝意。

6 《全宋文》(成都：巴蜀書社，1988-？)，卷1182，頁618。

月，司馬光在他的〈辭賜金第二劄子〉中又說：

> 仁宗皇帝天性寬仁，承累世餘烈，府庫充實，身雖節儉，而好施於人。群臣左右，貪求無厭，賜予之例，因茲浸廣，府庫之積，日益減耗。不幸又於五年之中再遭大喪，左藏、內藏、奉宸庫率皆空竭[7]。

這以前，治平四年一月英宗駕崩後不久，三司使韓絳、翰林學士張方平就曾有奏章說：

> 天下不幸，大行皇帝奄棄。仁宗升遐，及今未滿四年，大禍仍臻，內外公私，財費不贍，再頒優賞，府藏虛散。深惟方今至要，莫先財用。財用者，生民之命，為國之本，散之甚易，聚之實難。財用不足，生民無以為命，國非其國也。祖宗平天下，收斂其金帛，納之內帑諸庫，其所以遺後世之業厚矣。自康定、慶歷以來，發諸宿藏以助興發，百年之積，惟存空簿[8]。

按奏章內部的邏輯推斷，則當時已經匱乏得要「國非其國」了。

真的如此匱乏嗎？且不論三司本身的財政情況。以內帑諸庫論，則至少內藏庫的具體情況是司馬光、韓絳和張方平都無法得知的。司馬光的〈論財利疏〉就說過：「今內藏庫專以內臣掌之，不領於三司。其出納之多少，積蓄之虛實，簿書之是非，有司莫得而知也。」[9] 真宗咸平六年(1003年)以來，更有禁止宦官透露內藏財政情況，違者處斬的禁令

---

7 《全宋文》卷1194，頁105。

8 李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》(北京：中華書局，1979-1995)，卷209，頁5074。

9 《全宋文》卷1182，頁624。

[10]。後來在丁謂任三司使期間，真宗曾一度允許三司使預聞內藏數字。但這種鬆動，並不說明真宗願意把內藏收支完全公開化。據李燾記載，真宗大中祥符八年(1015年)

> 詔：「諸司庫務，如中使宣取金帛錢物，但依往例，畫時應副，不得以見管都數供報。如違，主典處死，監官除名決配。」舊制，庫務都數，雖三司使不得知之。丁謂充使日，自陳度支經費，宜知常數，上勉從其請，仍令副使以下不得預聞。而主藏攸司，不詳條禁，每內臣有所宣索，必盡數報之，或具列名物之籍以供。故特申警焉[11]。

可見真宗雖然允許三司使預聞內藏數字，對其他大臣卻仍嚴密封鎖消息。而從司馬光的〈論財利疏〉看，則至遲在仁宗末年以前，三司使也已失去了瞭解內藏情況的權力。這種局面，到神宗剛即位的時候並沒有改變。因此，幾位大臣講內藏空竭的話，至多只是猜測而已。

那麼，從我們現在掌握的材料看，內藏是否「惟存空簿」呢？按Robert Hartwell的估算，整個1060年代內帑諸庫與三司都是入大於出，而這些年的盈餘正好等於爲新法準備了投資[12]。此種與傳統「積貧」說法背道而馳的估算，雖然未被學界廣泛接受，但至少說明現有的材料並不能直接明瞭地證成「惟存空簿」之說。

而從神宗的行動上看，內藏並不像缺錢的樣子。例如，熙寧二年(1069年)七月，神宗初行王安石的均輸法。此法的概念是：

---

10 李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》卷54，頁1182。

11 李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》，卷85，頁1936。

12 Robert Hartwell, "The Imperial Treasuries: Finance and Power in Song China," *Bulletin of Sung Yuan Studies*, No. 20(1988), p. 36.

> 今發運使實總六路賦入，其職以制置茶、鹽、礬、酒稅為事，軍儲國用，多所仰給。宜假以錢貨，資其用度，周知六路財賦之有無而移用之。凡糴買稅斂上供之物，皆得徙貴就賤，用近易遠。令預知中都帑藏年支見在之定數，所當供辦者，得以從便變為蓄買，以待上令。稍收輕重斂散之權歸之公上，而制其有無，以便轉輸，省勞費，去重斂，寬農民[13]。

爲了提供均輸法的本錢，神宗賜給「內藏錢五百萬緡、上供米三百萬石。」[14] 行均輸法後兩個月左右，神宗又爲青苗法拿出內庫緡錢百萬當做本錢。兩項合計，則神宗在約兩個月之間至少拿出內帑六百萬貫。

按景德元年(1005)的澶淵之盟，不過約定宋每年給遼絹二十萬匹，銀十萬兩。談判前真宗對己方代表規定，萬不得已時可答應每年給一百萬貫匹兩[15]。這就是說，神宗約兩月間拿出的六百萬，相當於澶淵之盟真宗向契丹「買」和平的歲幣的20倍，或者說相當於談判前真宗底線的六倍。按汪聖鐸據現有的材料的推算，「元豐改制前內藏歲入出額約在五百萬貫匹兩上下，而宋朝歲入直接由中央控制者(包括用於邊費而轉入沿邊三路財計者)約三千萬貫匹兩。」[16] 這樣，六百萬就相當於當時中央直控歲入的五分之一，同時又超過了內藏一般的歲入額。從這幾個推算可見，內帑六百萬貫絕不是小數目。而神宗拿出此錢時即位剛兩年多，新法的種種生財之道尚未見效。我們很難想像，在新法尚未開始的時候，內藏能在兩年多時間內從「惟存空簿」變得有六百萬貫錢用於日常花費以外的開支。這就說明，神宗即位之初大臣們講的「率皆空

---

13 脫脫等，《宋史》(北京：中華書局，1977)，卷186，頁4556。

14 同上。

15 李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》，卷58，頁1292-1293。

16 汪聖鐸，《兩宋財政史》(北京：中華書局，1995)，頁602。

竭」、「惟存空簿」之類的話皆與事實不符[17]。

其實從變法開始以前司馬光的態度來看，他自己也知道國家的財政問題並沒有像他說的那樣嚴重。爲了勸皇帝節儉，司馬光不免要大講冗費造成的財政困境。但皇帝真要大規模精簡開支時，他卻反而不急了。熙寧元年(1068)，神宗堅持任命司馬光負責裁減國用，司馬光堅決不肯。他對神宗解釋道：

> 竊惟國用所以不足者，在於用度太奢，賞賜不節，宗室繁多，官職冗濫，軍旅不精。此五者，必須陛下與兩府大臣及三司官吏，深思其患，力救其弊，積以歲月，庶幾有效，固非愚臣一朝一夕所能裁減也。若但欲知慶曆二年裁減國用制度，比見今支費不同數目，只下三司令供析聞奏，立可盡見。臣愚以為不必更差官置局，專領此事。況臣所修《資治通鑑》委實文字浩大，朝夕少暇，難以更兼錢穀差遣[18]。

這樣，他不但自己不願辦這件事，而且還勸皇帝慢慢來。《資治通鑑》固然重要，但假如國家財政真的「空竭」到了「國非其國」的程度，司馬光又怎能爲了編書不管財政問題？

那麼在王安石變法以前，北宋朝廷到底有沒有「積貧」的現象？我想答案應該是當時有局部的「積貧」而無全局的「空竭」。許多學者已經指出，從宋真宗搞「天書」、「封禪」等「神道設教」的活動後，政府經費日益拮据。汪聖鐸認爲仁宗、英宗統治時期是北宋財政「危機初現階段」。Paul Smith也指出，到英宗末年，講各類冗費對財政的負擔

17 程民生也認為，熙寧初內庫的花費說明「治平時內庫有大量財富」。見程民生，〈論北宋財政的特點與積貧的假象〉，頁33。

18 《全宋文》，卷1196，頁124。

已成了老生常談[19]。我這裡想澄清的是，北宋雖然有冗費的問題，但單就政府財政承受能力來說，至少到新法推行以前，所謂不足只表現在三司系統和某些地方政府(如災荒地區和陝西前線地區)身上。如果我們把皇帝私財(特別是內藏庫)算作朝廷財政的一部分，則北宋朝廷完全有能力支付新法以前的各種開支。

從《續資治通鑑長編》、《續資治通鑑》等史料看，至遲從真宗年間起，皇帝賜、借錢帛給三司等政府機構是常事。而所謂借的錢帛，其實並不是像銀行貸款那樣非還不可。三司如果久欠不還，皇帝就只好算了[20]。例如慶曆七年(1047)三司使張方平上疏說：

> 慶曆二年六月，聖恩特賜內藏銀一百萬兩，絹二百萬匹，仍盡放免日前所貸內庫錢帛。慶曆二年八月，又蒙恩賜內藏紬絹三百萬匹。據此銀絹六百萬匹、兩，為錢一千二百萬緡。慶曆五年，又賜江南所鑄大銅錢十一萬，當小錢一百一十萬緡。及今未滿五年，相添費用已盡，乃是每年常將內藏銀絹近三百萬緡，供助三司經費，仍復調發諸路錢物應副，方始得足[21]。

可見三司特別匱乏時，皇帝不但放免以前的貸款，而且繼續補助三司。爲什麼非補助不可呢？因爲如果政府因經費枯竭而不能辦事，則後果也不利於皇帝。

據Hartwell的統計，從960年到1069年的109年間，至少有61年中內藏庫通過賜予或借貸的方法資助了三司。而據Hartwell的估算，從960年

19 Paul J. Smith, *Taxing Heaven's Storehouse: Horses, Bureaucrats, and the Destruction of the Sichuan Tea Industry, 1074-1224*(Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1991), 113.

20 汪聖鐸認為，多數借貸是還了的，免還的是少數，見汪聖鐸，《兩宋財政史》，頁601。但要之實在還不了時便可不還。

21 李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》，卷161，頁3895-3896。

到1069年內帑的盈餘和三司的赤字差不多正好互相抵消[22]。雖然千載以下對當時財政數字的計算難以有十分的把握，但至少內藏經常資助三司應當是確實的。

因爲宋臣奏議往往強調內藏的儲蓄和支出而不太提內藏的收入，現存史料容易給人造成以下錯覺，即北宋君臣動用內藏錢帛時是在逐漸耗盡祖宗的積蓄。例如張方平在上引的奏疏中就問仁宗：「不知內藏蓄積幾何，可供今後支撥？」[23] 其實內藏庫雖然有大量的花費，但又有可觀的收入。據汪聖鐸的研究，內藏收入甚爲複雜。大體言之，金銀的收入，有坑冶和上供兩途。絹帛的收入，則有相當多的軍、州把賦稅收上來的絹帛直接送內藏庫。(太宗初年有約全國四分之一的州軍把收上的絹帛直接上供。)內藏的銅錢，則除了有司的上供和皇帝的征調外，每年新鑄的銅錢都有一大部分直送內藏[24]。內藏既然有這麼多的收入，那麼內藏蓄積是否逐漸耗盡關鍵取決於收入能否補足支出。本文前面已經指出，神宗即位時內藏並不空竭。所以，王安石變法以前內藏的收入應該是可以應付它在補助政府經費上的開銷的。也就是說，變法以前北宋的內帑與公帑合起來足以應付當時皇帝私人和政府的開銷。換言之，上引Hartwell內帑盈餘和三司赤字相抵消的話，雖不中亦不遠矣。

從以上的分析看，則內藏的資助與借貸使三司和地方政府的財政困境得到緩衝。但從更深一層看，我們又可以說內藏與三司的劃分實際上人爲地造成了經費緊缺的假象。這是因爲既然內藏有能力補三司之不足，那麼如果把內藏管皇宮外開支的部分劃歸三司，或者將三司和內藏劃歸同一政府機構，政府豈不就不缺經費了嗎？其實這個問題，北宋人也已想到了。例如，司馬光在〈論財利疏〉中就曾對仁宗皇帝提議：

---

22 Hartwell, 36.

23 李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》，卷161，頁3896。

24 汪聖鐸，頁595至599。

臣願復置總計使之官，使宰相領之。凡天下之金帛錢穀，隸於三司及不隸三司，如內藏，奉宸庫之類，總計使皆統之。小事則官長專達，大事則謀於總計使而後行之。歲終則上其出入之數於總計使，總計使量入以為出。……凡三司使、副使、判官、轉運使、及掌內藏、奉宸等庫之官，皆委總計使察其能否，考其功狀，以奏而誅賞之。若總計使久試無效，則乞陛下罷退其人，更置之[25]。

假如北宋真的設總計使統一管理包括內帑在內的天下財政，則此總計使恐怕就不會感到朝廷真的那樣缺錢。但事實上，司馬光的建議並沒有被仁宗皇帝採納。要瞭解北宋皇帝爲什麼一方面堅持要內藏獨立於正常文官行政系統之外，一方面又讓內藏兼管調節政府經費，則我們必須探討內藏在北宋的作用。據汪聖鐸的分析，北宋皇帝做如此安排有三個目的：

一是強制性儲存財賦。從太祖、太宗創建此庫的動機看，含有對理財官吏不放心的因素，總覺得這些人不甚愛惜國財，擔心其不留意儲蓄，怕將來遇到特殊情況無以應付。另外，太祖、太宗都有意收復幽燕，用兵費財，他們也有切身體會，乃決心以此強制性節省開支。……二是直接掌握左右財政的權力。……三司歷年多須向內藏挪借，皇帝通過拒絕或允許，在一定程度上可限制三司使的行動。三是有利於掩蓋皇室費財的眞相。將皇室支用同其他如軍費等開支混在一起，有遮人耳目的作用，使人難以瞭解皇室支用財賦的準確數額，減少人們對

25 《全宋文》，卷1182，頁626。參見李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》，卷196，頁4760。

皇室用財的注意和議論[26]。

從這三種目的看，內藏的功能有助於皇權。但在實際運作中，三司在財政上對內藏的依靠，對君臣雙方的鋪張浪費和好大喜功的行為都可起限制作用。因爲雖然內藏實際上能夠滿足三司的需要，但從制度上看，三司只要一靠皇帝賜、借內帑，就是國用不足的表現。這樣，就對君臣雙方都造成了開源節流的壓力。同時，內藏給三司的錢帛越多，則留下給皇帝私人用的就越少。這就造成了限制皇室揮霍的壓力。而這些由於三司經費不足造成的壓力，又令北宋君臣在財政上無法完全滿足現狀。尤其是儒家重積蓄的傳統更使許多大臣在變法以前的幾十年裡不斷呼籲節減國用。例如，蘇軾就在他的策論中說：

> 夫為國有三計：有萬世之計，有一時之計，有不終月之計。古者三年耕必有一年之蓄。以三十年之通則可以九年無饑也。歲之所入足用而有餘，是以九年之蓄常閒而無用。卒有水旱之變、盜賊之憂，則官可以自辦而民不知。若此者，天不能使之災，地不能使之貧，四夷盜賊不能使之困，此萬世之計也。而其不能者，一歲之入纔足以為一歲之出。天下之產僅足以供天下之用。其平居雖不至於取虐於民，而有急則不免於厚賦。故其國可靜而不可動，可逸而不可勞。此亦一時之計也。至於最下而無謀者，量出以為入。用之不給，則取之益多。天下晏然無大患難而盡用衰世苟且之法，不知有急則將何以加之。此所謂不終月之計也[27]。

---

26 汪聖鐸，頁602。

27 馬端臨，《文獻通考》（北京：中華書局，1986），卷24，頁231；《蘇軾文集》（北京：中華書局，1986），卷8，頁268。

因爲蘇軾反對厚賦，所以他認爲走出「不終月之計」的困境而達到「九年之蓄」的辦法是裁減用度而非擴充政府財源。他寫道：

> 人君之於天下，俯己以就人則易為功，仰人以援己則難為力。是故廣取以給用，不如節用而廉取之為易也。臣請得以小民之家而推之:夫民方其困窮時，所望不過十金之資。計其衣食之費，妻子之奉，出入於十金之中寬然而有餘。及其一旦稍稍蓄聚，衣食既足，則心意之欲，日以漸廣。所入益眾，而所欲益亦不給。不知罪其用之不節，而以為求之未至也。是以富而愈貪，求愈多而財愈不供。此其為惑，未可以知其所終也。盍亦反其始而思之：夫嚮者豈能寒而不衣、饑而不食乎？今天下汲汲乎以財之不足為病，何以過此[28]？

這也就是說，當時政府掌握的資源完全可以滿足政府的需要，只要君臣都知道節儉，政府就能轉匱乏爲盈餘。

當然，實際上裁減用度遠非易事。而如果有辦法讓內藏產生盈餘，則有些大臣又認爲與其讓它盈餘下去，不如用這些錢帛補國用，以便減輕人民的賦稅。但這樣一來，等於延續三司對內藏的依賴，亦即延續制度定義上的「國用不足。」據《長編》記載，真宗天禧元年(1018)九月，

> 翰林學士、右諫議大夫李迪為給事中、參知政事，依前會靈觀副使。迪嘗獨對內東門，上出三司使馬元方所上歲出入財用數以示迪。時仍歲旱蝗，上憂不給，問何以濟，迪曰：「祖宗初置內藏庫，欲辦兵復西北故土及以支凶荒。今邊鄙無他費，陛

28 《文獻通考》，卷24，頁231；《蘇軾文集》，卷8，頁267-268。

下用此以佐國用，則賦斂寬，民不勞矣。」上曰：「朕欲用李士衡代元方，俟其至，當出金帛數百萬借三司。」迪曰：「天子於財用無內外，願詔賜三司以示德澤，何必曰借？」上悅[29]。

這樣用花費內帑的方法寬賦斂，自然就離九年之蓄的理想更遠了。爲什麼北宋那麼多忠心盡責的大臣都不認真爲政府達成這個理想努力呢？我以爲除了想寬民力之外，還有另一個原因：九年之蓄雖然在理論上是大好事，但在實際上有的大臣又怕盈餘多了會引誘皇帝及其寵臣浪費。也就是說，爲了防止朝廷君臣浪費民脂民膏，寧可讓政府的日子過得緊一點；如果財政事實上並不緊張，那也最好不要讓皇帝有寬裕之感。蘇軾不是說了，在「一歲之入纔足以爲一歲之出」的情況下「其國可靜而不可動，可逸而不可勞」嗎？那麼從反對生事的大臣角度來看，迫使朝廷「靜而不動」地與民休息的最穩妥的方式，豈不正是製造「一歲之入纔足以爲一歲之出」的氣氛？換言之，三司對內藏的依靠固然有鞏固皇權的一面，但國用不足的壓力又是「主靜」的一方(它可能是大臣，但有時也可能是皇帝)牽制「好生事」的一方(它可能是皇帝，但有時也可能是大臣)的絕好工具。如果想揮霍的一方是皇帝，則三司對內藏財物的占用，簡直就是對皇權的一種限制。

例如，真宗即位之初，朝廷的財政似乎還很寬裕。但真宗的輔臣反而害怕真宗會因此養成亂花費的習慣。據《長編》載，咸平元年(999)十一月，

三司上經費之數，上曰：「先帝以財賦國之大本，莫不求諸中道而為其永制。」輔臣曰：「先帝非止愛人嗇費，至於節損服

29 李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》，卷90，頁2078。

用，躬御澣濯之衣，蓋前古哲王莫能偕也。」上初命三司具中外錢穀大數以聞，鹽鐵使陳恕久而不進，上命輔臣詰之，恕曰：「天子富於春秋，若知府庫充羡，恐生侈心，故不敢盡也。」上聞而善之[30]。

真宗雖然表面上對這種竭力引導他節儉的行爲表示「善之」，但在實際行動上仍不免表現出「生侈心」的傾向。所以，老臣李沆想方設法要把真宗的注意力引向國事艱難的一面。據《宋史・李沆傳》，

沆為相，王旦參政事，以西北用兵，或至旰食。旦嘆曰：「我輩安能坐致太平，得優游無事耶？」沆曰：「少有憂勤，足為警戒。他日四方寧謐，朝廷未必無事。」後契丹和親，旦問何如，沆曰：「善則善矣，然邊患既息，恐人主漸生侈心耳。」旦未以為然。沆又日取四方水旱盜賊奏之，旦以為細事不足煩上聽。沆曰：「人主少年，當使知四方艱難。不然，血氣方剛，不留意聲色犬馬，則土木、甲兵、禱祠之事作矣。吾老，不及見此，此參政他日之憂也。」沆沒後，真宗以契丹既和，西夏納款，遂封岱、祠汾，大營宮觀，蒐講墜典，靡有暇日。旦親見王欽若、丁謂等所為，欲諫則業已同之，欲去則上遇之厚，乃以沆先識之遠，嘆曰：「李文靖眞聖人也。」當時遂謂之「聖相」[31]。

從引文可見，真宗朝許多士大夫都認爲皇帝大肆浪費的行爲與他感受不到國事艱難有直接關係。李沆的事例也說明，有時大臣講各種艱難的主

30 李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》，卷43，頁921

31 《宋史》，卷282，頁9539。參見李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》，卷56，頁1243。

要目的，並非呼籲解決具體問題，而是想造成一種國用需要儉省的氣氛。

眾所周知，在神宗朝新法實行期間，政府財政呈盈餘狀態。研究這種盈餘造成的後果，對瞭解新法以前的「積貧」很有幫助。以下這條材料出自蘇轍《龍川略志》。因為內容至關重要，所以大段抄在這裡。

> 商賈入東南末鹽錢，舊法屬榷貨務，以應副河北見錢鈔。熙寧以來，諸路苗、役、坊場寬剩錢，舊止在本路封樁，非上供數。元祐初，苗、役(青苗法、免役法)既罷，寬剩錢所在山積，諸公擘畫計綱，般入京師，特置元豐庫收管，以應副陝西糧草。元豐大抵以此錢為根本，其他蓋微末矣。議者以為左藏之外，特置此庫，與唐瓊林、大盈何異？後世啓人主侈心，非良策也。
>
> 此庫時隸尚書，予為右丞，有三老吏稍諳事，呼問之曰：「末鹽錢其源無窮，然辦河北軍糧，所餘無幾矣，所以應副陝西者，賴苗、役封樁錢耳。此錢今雖尚多，然十年後般運告竭，奈陝西何？」二吏曰：「未嘗議及此，請徐思之。」久之，乃告曰：「此錢用盡，則無繼矣。然陝西糧草，舊三司亦不能供，蓋恃內藏庫時有撥賜耳。」予曰：「我所聞正如此。」乃與微仲(呂大防)議之，微仲愕然，蓋初不慮此也。予曰：「內藏不撥賜久矣，紬絹絲綿至積久損爛，出賣每疋二三百者，由此故也。若今不講，後難復矣。」微仲以元豐蓄聚為己功，不樂予說，然無以相拒，乃因陝西闕乏，乞撥一百萬貫，朝廷應副其半。乃宣仁山陵事起，舊例內藏撥二百萬貫。微仲曰：「不必請之內藏，只元豐可了。」予曰：「雖然，不若循例，

而愛惜元豐。」不得已見從[32]。

這條材料同時說明了好幾個問題。首先，新法時期的政府的盈餘，不但導致了封樁庫的大筆積蓄，而且造成了內藏財帛的過分積壓。按蘇轍的分析，內藏的紬絹絲綿之所以多到積久損爛的程度，主要原因不是內藏收入的增多，而是內藏不再補助政府經費。這就從側面說明，內藏收支平衡的狀況，是在內藏補助三司時(亦即所謂「國用不足」時)纔能達到的。同時，老吏的回話也說明，在王安石變法以前，內藏補陝西軍費已經形成慣例，但行新法後此例因爲久不援引，纔漸被遺忘。

內藏紬絹絲綿的損爛貶值，表明一味地增加庫藏其實是一種浪費行爲。而這種浪費，不但表現在紡織品的損耗，而且表現在銅錢的積壓。錢本是交換的工具。錢的流通量不夠，即影響經濟貿易。本來神宗時大增鑄錢數量，是爲了解決社會上錢荒的問題。新法時期財政盈餘的結果，卻使大批銅錢被封存到庫裡(包括朝廷的封樁庫和皇帝的內藏庫，但似以封樁爲主)，喪失了流通的作用[33]。但如果盈餘造成的積累是一種浪費，則沒有盈餘就反而是對資源更有效的利用。這樣，變法以前的「國用不足」就變得更可愛了。

蘇轍的材料還說明，認爲朝廷積蓄太多會啓人主侈心的看法，在新法被廢的哲宗元祐年間仍然存在。許多學者已經指出，神宗把很多錢財封存在封樁庫，是爲了準備發兵收回燕雲十六州的軍費。明乎此，則反戰的元祐大臣在廢除新法的種種生財之道後不努力保存封樁庫的積蓄也就不那麼奇怪了。

---

32 蘇轍，《龍川略志龍川別志》(北京：中華書局，1982)，《龍川略志》卷8，頁48。

33 王曾瑜，《王安石變法簡論》，頁139；宮澤知之，〈北宋的財政與貨幣經濟〉，張北譯，收入《日本中青年學者論中國史：宋元明清卷》(上海古籍出版社，1995)，頁102-104。

與上引李迪對內藏庫的態度相似，元祐年間的范祖禹也認爲封樁庫的儲藏應當拿出來補國用，以減輕百姓的負擔。與李迪所不同的是，范祖禹要求的不是部分的資助，而是把全部封樁錢交給戶部和諸路轉運司。范祖禹在元祐四年(1089年)七月的上奏中就說：「昔先帝有經略四夷之志，是故別貯以待用。今陛下垂拱守成，志於無爲，蓄聚於此，將安用之？」也就是說，既然不想打仗，存那麼多軍費豈不是浪費[34]！

范祖禹減輕百姓負擔的用意或許不用懷疑，但我們可以想見，如果朝廷真的把所有的軍費儲蓄用於政府日常開支，那將對收復燕雲十六州的計畫起到釜底抽薪的作用。這是因爲，軍費儲蓄一旦用盡，皇帝即使想開戰，支付戰爭費用也沒有那麼容易了。筆者現在還無法直接證明范祖禹或其他元祐大臣曾經有過釜底抽薪的目的。但從後來哲宗晚年的情況看，經費短缺確實有阻礙戰爭發展的作用。

哲宗元符二年(1099)，北宋因爲連年對西夏的戰爭，軍費負擔似乎到了連加上內藏庫的資助都難以支持的程度。據《長編》記載，當時哲宗

> 詔：「鄜延、涇原、熙河、環慶路見管軍賞銀絹不多，慮緩急闕用，特於內藏庫支撥銀絹共二百萬匹兩，赴逐路經略司封樁，專充準備邊事及招納之用。內鄜延、涇原路各六十萬匹兩，熙河、環慶路各四十萬匹兩，仰戶部交割計綱，起發前去。」既而內藏庫闕銀，以絹七十萬匹貼支，上止令應副五十萬，以封樁夏國歲賜絹二十萬貼支，因諭曾布等曰：「內藏絹才百萬，已輟其半。」布曰：「公私匱乏如此，邊事何可不收斂？關中民力困憊已甚，涇原與熙河通接邊面，便須為休息

34 范祖禹，〈上哲宗乞以封樁錢賜戶部及諸路轉運司〉，收入趙汝愚編，《宋朝諸臣奏議》(上海古籍出版社，1999)，頁1151。

計。」上欣納之[35]。

當然最後宋夏講和並不光是宋一方的事，但至少經費的缺乏迫使哲宗君臣不得不考慮收斂邊事。

綜上所述，王安石變法以前北宋朝廷雖然有財政緊張之感，但完全有牽補度日的能力。這樣，司馬光等保守派纔有本錢反對以增收改善財政的新法。同時，牽補度日雖然違反『九年之蓄』的理想，卻有助於限制揮霍和阻止戰爭。這樣，政府財政『積貧』現象對主張省賦斂、寬民力的保守派來說，或許還有他們難以言傳的吸引力。

35 李燾，《續資治通鑑長編》，卷505，頁12043-12044。

Inspired Tinkering: The Qing Creation of the Province*

Kent Guy
Professor of History and East Asian Studies, University of Washington

The historian's eye, searching for the stuff of grand strategy, the dynamics of policy formation, or evidence of the unseen movement of social change, usually passes over the routine records of personnel change and official careers which mark the daily life of any empire. Yet buried in this documentary detritus are stories as rich as any found in more conventional sources, and often more compelling for being cast in the form of human narratives. This is particularly the case in the history of late imperial China. Slight as he might other aspects of administration, no Chinese emperor could afford to ignore the importance of recruiting and evaluating human talent, given the ideology on which his rule rested, the nature of Qing law and the routines of the court. In particular, no Qing emperor could or did ignore the

* The chapter numbers in this essay refer to the Chapters of my forthcoming book, which will be published by University of Washington Press.

task of appointing governors to each of the provinces of the Qing empire, for governors were the imperial court's eyes and ears in a sea of local and regional interests. The following introduces my book on the Qing Provinces.

This book will use the records of provincial governors' appointments made under four emperors--the Shunzhi Emperor(1644-1661), the Kangxi Emperor(r. 1661-1723), the Yongzheng Emperor(r. 1723-1736)and the Qianlong Emperor (r. 1736-1796)--to examine the evolution of provincial government in late imperial China. Each of these emperors had his own approach to provincial appointments; indeed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the differences among them were probably more apparent that the similarities. The Shunzhi Emperor sought to fill positions established by the Ming with people of at least modest loyalty to the new dynasty. The Kangxi Emperor was the first to confront the diversity of the Qing Empire and as much as any Qing emperor sought to match provinces with specific officials. The Yongzheng Emperor sought governors with energy and vision to match his own and by their appointment to infuse provincial bureaucracy with new vigor and probity. The Qianlong emperor sought harmony, and in his long reign fostered a relatively homogeneous and tightly woven corps of provincial governors. The Yongzheng and Qianlong Emperors even announced their different provincial preferences by edict at the beginnings of their reigns.

But from a longer perspective, these monarchs together established provincial boundaries and procedures for rule within them that served the Qing dynasty throughout its life. The boundaries, and perhaps even some of the forms they established still exist today and a study of nineteenth- or twentieth-century Chinese history could well take provincial government as its focus. Governors played prominent roles, perhaps even the predominant

role in most of the great events of nineteenth-century history, and continue to play major administrative roles in the Chinese State today. But the interest of a study of the nineteenth or twentieth centuries would not be the institution of governorship, but the way in which China changed around them. The elements of provincial government were all present earlier, and it is the work of this volume to show how they were created. The remainder of this introduction will present some of the broad hypotheses which will inform the book, hypotheses about the Qing State, the Qing empire in China, and about the men who served as provincial governors.

A. The State in the High Qing Period

For a number of years, historians of China have used the term "high Qing" to describe China's long eighteenth century, the years between the suppression of the last resistance to Qing rule in roughly the 1680s and the beginning of rebellion against the dynasty in the last years of the eighteenth century.[1] The coinage describes, with the felicitous adjective "high," a period of relative peace, political stability and rising commercial prosperity. Demographic evidence alone the doubling of China's population, which Ho Ping-ti carefully documented--suggested that Chinese of the eighteenth century were living better, healthier and more secure lives than in any earlier period of Chinese history. But beyond this, the era was one in which "traditional social and political institutions

1 The terms seems first to have been used by Frederic Wakeman in "High Ch'ing 1683-1839," in James B. Crowley, *Modern East Asia: Essays in Interpretation*, pp. 1-28, though he draws on the earlier essay by Ho Ping-ti, "The Significance of the Ch'ing Period in Chinese History," *Journal of Asian Studies*, 26/2.

attained their maturity," and "leisurely fulfillment and enrichment on the realm of culture and the arts."[2] Not surprisingly, the age was fondly remembered in the later, darker era when the Chinese entered their long nineteenth-century winter of discontent.

More recent scholarship has uncovered considerable elite anxieties in the last decades of the period, a sense that the enormous polity China was becoming could barely be contained within the frameworks of traditional institutions. Disparities in wealth, opportunities and beliefs were emerging as never before, to such a degree that we may question whether, in social terms, high Qing really was a single era. Politically, however, there were consistencies through the late Qing era. But the question of what the political underpinnings of the era were is somewhat more controversial. Granting the Qing their due as conquerors, the distinguished sociologist and historian Ho Ping-ti credits them with having created the largest empire the Chinese had ever had. But he attributes the domestic glories of high Qing to the strength of Chinese society, rather than the accomplishments of what was for Ho a foreign state.[3] Yet there is no question that the Qing's contributions to Chinese life in the eighteenth century were substantial. In the last quarter of the seventeenth century, the Kangxi Emperor rebuilt the Grand Canal, and restored the flood protection works along the middle and lower courses of the Yellow River. Rivers made navigable and roads made passable in what has been called China's "great age of dike building"[4] extended further through the empire than ever before and the peaceful intercourse along these roads

2 See Ho Ping-ti, pp. 193-4.

3 On the question of whether the Qing was really a foreign state to the Chinese, see the recent exchange between Evelyn Rawsky and Ho Ping-ti.

4 Peter C. Perdue, *Exhausting the Earth.*

and rivers tied the regions of China together more firmly than ever before. Bin Wong and his collaborators have argued that the stability of the period rested on its full relief granaries and traced the efforts of local and central administrators to manage grain storage and distribution.[5] Pierre-Etienne Will has described the vigorous efforts of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century state to combat natural disasters and subsistence crises. Madeleine Zelin has argued that the financial reform of the Yongzheng years showed that late imperial China to be a "dynamic state, struggling to devise its own formula for rational and efficient bureaucratic rule."[6] The eighteenth-century Chinese state was certainly not as present to its subjects as its European counterparts were, but it was a much more active presence than any Chinese predecessor.

It will be the argument of this book that the agents of this new presence were in fact Qing provincial governors. In a study of civilian administration, the focus on provincial governors should require little justification, for governors played vital roles in each of the six traditional division of Chinese administration. Provincial governors supervised lower-level local officials, appointing some and recommending the dismissal of others as needs and opportunities arose. Assisted by provincial finance commissioners (who were also known as lieutenant governors), Qing provincial governors were responsible for expenditures made from the provincial treasuries, which contained nearly one quarter of the revenue collected by the dynasty. They oversaw and often personally attended provincial examinations, the most important step in the civil service examination ladder. They also provided logistical support for military garrisons located in their provinces, and

5 R. Bin Wong and Pierre Etienne Will, editors, *Nourishing the People*.

6 Madeleine Zelin, *The Magistrate's Tael, Rationalizing Fiscal Reform in Eighteenth Century Ch'ing China*, p. xiv.

themselves commanded garrison forces. They supervised and were responsible for the financial accounting on local engineering projects, and reviewed all criminal and civil sentences meted out by local officials before they were sent to the capital for approval. Not only were they important functionaries, provincial governors were the authors of the documents on which studies of the Qing government and its capacities at the local level rest the palace memorials.

The notion that the Qing dynasty "created" provincial governors belies the image, quite correct in many other respects, of a broad institutional continuity between the Ming and the Qing dynasties. As Chapter I will show however, the idea of appointing a single governor to each of a series of large territorial division in China was neither proven nor popular at the end of the Ming. Province-sized units and their governors were so closely associated with some of the debacles of early Chinese imperial history that the Song dynasty(960-1279) had done without them altogether. The Mongol Yuan(1279-1368) offered a more stable model for delegating territorial authority but it was one that few Chinese regimes could follow. The Ming (1368-1644) did appoint regular provincial officials, but their function was one of military coordination. Their functions were sufficiently different from those of their Qing successors that Charles Hucker long ago instituted the practice of translating the term used for the chief provincial officer in Ming and Qing times, *xunfu*, as "grand coordinator" when it referred to a Ming official, and "governor" when it referred to a Qing official. What the Qing created was not the title or the office of *xunfu*, but a new type of *xunfu*, officials who were regularly appointed to provincial office and had both military and civilian functions to perform. What was new about Qing governors was that they were self-consciously middlemen. This in itself was

an innovation in Chinese officialdom, where all Chinese officials were seen as deriving their authority directly from the emperor. Qing governors were poised between military and civilian, central and local, Manchus and Chinese.[7]

The relations which governors were meant to enjoy with the other strata of officials were expressed best, Chapter 2 will argue, by the procedures that the dynasty set out for appointing them. On the one hand, qualified lieutenant governors could be promoted to governor, and the two positions stood near to top of a ladder of posts which stretched from county magistrate, the lowest centrally appointed territorial official in Qing China, to governor-general, who were the superiors of governors. At least some governors in all periods, and most in some times, had ascended this ladder, and internalized its standards and responsibilities. Climbing the ladder could take a lifetime,as the example of Li Hu in Chapter 5, who rose from a first appointment as a magistrate in Shandong to conclude his career as governor of Guangdong demonstrated. Li had the good fortune to live at a moment when the Qing provincial order was relatively open to promotions. Nonetheless his success depended on a fairly formidable array of contacts and skills. Assessing these skills and the credibility of those who reported them was a challenge, but the effort to do so was implicit in the Qing territorial order. More directly than earlier dynasties, the Qing had to confront the question--or was it really a conundrum?--of competence, and to define how, by whom, and to what ends ability could be measured. Conversely, the eighteenth century developed the politics of incompetence to a new height, evolving

7 Many official titles in earlier dynasties have been translated as "governor." I certainly have no quibble with these translations; the point here is merely that the functions of Qing officials were different.

more elaborate means of representing and sanctioning administrative failings. Some of the dynasty's structures of promotion and discipline, such as the gigantic salary fines discussed in Chapter 10, may strain credibility, particularly in sensibilities heavily influenced by Weber. In fact, as Angela Zito has warned, we must guard against reading the Qing imperial structure as evidence of "transcendant rationalism" as it was defined in Europe.[8] Nonetheless, some notion of competence and sanctions for incompetence were the price the dynasty had to pay for linking its senior officials to its junior officials.

Not all governors came up through the ranks, however. Qing appointment procedures also allowed the emperor to appoint whomever he chose to a provincial post, regardless of rank or previous service, simply by designating a vacancy was one requiring a special appointee. This designation was applied by a decree which, in fact, was not entered into the official record. But it was possible to identify special appointees, since they held positions at the time of their appointment from which it would not have been possible to be promoted to governor. As Chapter 5 demonstrates, special appointments allowed the court to respond to moments of real emergency. Special appointments also allowed the court to act at times of perceived emergency, when provincial personnel had to be changed to meet the requirements of a new emperor or courtier, or the demands of a new policy. Perhaps the most common way special appointments were used was to move governors serving in one province to another province that was perceived to require an appointee with more experience. It was a mark, however, of the importance the Qing attributed to procedures and the

---

8 Angela Zito, *Of Body and Brush*.

assumptions on which they were based, that such appointments were used cautiously.

Although the creation of provincial governors was fraught with implications for the structure and capacity of rule, the dynasty inserted governors fairly seamlessly into the traditional framework of imperial government. Traditionally, the work of governing China was divided into six categories, each of which represented by a division, or board of the central governments. These were the Boards of Personnel, Finance, Rites, Punishments, War and Public Works, and Chinese accounts of their government were organized in like fashion. When officials during the Qing dynasty were assigned to edit the *Da Qing huidian*(Administrative Law of the Qing Dynasty), or the much larger *Da Qing huidian shili*(Precedents and Applications of the Administrative Law of the Dynasty), they had to deal with a relatively new institution the provincial government--that did not fit any defined categories. The editors' solution to this problem demonstrated the pervasiveness of provincial institutions during the Qing, and the remarkable capacity of the Qing to adapt their innovations to existing Chinese administrative patterns. Instead of creating a new chapter for governors, references to governors' tasks were inserted throughout existing chapters. In effect, both editorially and institutionally the Qing achieved the delicate feat of inserting a foundation under a structure of territorial rule that had become rather shaky during the late Ming. In so doing, the forgoing will argue, the dynasty not only laid the foundations for the prosperity of the "high Qing period," but perhaps also gave the Chinese imperial order a new, and longer lease on life. It is pointless to speculate about whether the collapse of the Ming might have led to a collapse of the dynastic system, in the absence of other changes. But certainly the survival into the twentieth century of dynastic rule

in China depended on the evolution of a more sophisticated and efficient presence at the territorial level than was possible during the Ming.

Nothing in this system was inevitable. The Manchus were perhaps more inclined by heritage and forced by circumstance to delegate territorial authority than were other dynasties. They inherited a geographical template for provinicial rule, but it was one that had been stretched beyond recognition by the military emergencies of the sixteenth century. The Qing changes in China's provincial government were not so much the unfolding of a new order of things as a case of inspired tinkering, punctuated by missteps and blessed on many occasions with luck. Qing provincial rule took about a century to evolve. New provincial institutions occupied by civilian personnel were established in north China in the 1650s; in the late 1660s and early 1670s provincial government began to assume a recognizable form in the lower Yangzi valley. Civilian provincial order came to the southeast coast in the 1680s, and it was really 1700 before the middle Yangzi and Lingnan were actually governed rather than being merely occupied. It was the 1740s before the southwest became a part of China's provincial order, and changes occurred in boundaries and jurisdictions in China's northwest until the 1750s. Just as Susan Naquin and Evelyn Rawski have argued that we must understand the dynastic cycle in regional rather than national terms, so perhaps we need to think of political arrangements of high Qing as having been secured in different times within China's regions. As the argument below will suggest, we should think of China's provincial order neither as a structure imposed on the Chinese by foreign overlords, nor as the residue of Chinese administrative tradition. The system of provincial government was produced through an interaction of the Manchu state and the people it governed. Governors translated and mediated in this interaction.

B. The Empire

It has come to be generally accepted that although nature creates geographical features, it is human actions that give them meaning. The investing of geographical space with human meaning is a cultural act, a construing of physical locations as far or near, as destinations, routes or boundaries according to their locations in a mental rather than a physical universe. Chinese had been mapping and naming, remembering and redefining their land for centuries. The early Manchu rulers were hardly in a position to wholly reinvent the map of China, but they had to come to some understanding of the territory they ruled, to create meaningful space out of conquered places. While the new political units which the Qing created were not insignificant, they were probably less important in the long run than the new relations the dynasty created among geographical areas. In this process, provincial governors were crucial, for they were officials who most commonly moved from one part of the empire to the other.[9]

Despite the impression of homogeneity fostered by common titles and tremendous centralization of the Qing official order, China's provinces were quite different realms. The several regions of China experienced different patterns of settlement, economic cycles, and had different strategic imperatives, as the Qing were to discover as they set out their provincial administrative establishment. The most useful way of conceiving of regional difference in

9 This claim will be explored further in Chapter 5. Qing personnel procedures encouraged the promotion of promising junior official within provinces, but actively discourages promotions of provincial level personnel in the same province in which they had served as junior officials.

China is the model set forth by G. William Skinner in his essays on marketing and the structure of regional systems in China. Skinner proposes that we consider China as consisting of "nine major 'islands' of relatively dense population,...each surrounded by concentric gradients of declining population." Most of these 'islands' were defined by a major river valley and its tributaries, and consisted of a functionally integrated urban system, the effective hinterland of a major city.[10] These regions were not the political units of Ming or Qing China. There was some correspondence between provincial boundaries and macro-regional boundaries, but it was, as Skinner remarks, "grossly imperfect."[11] In fact, Skinner hypothesizes that certain political boundaries were drawn expressly to divide up concentrations of economic power that could pose a threat to the state.[12] Macro-regions were not provinces, but they did define the economic, social and cultural realities that the Qing dynasty confronted as it set out to define its provinces.

A study of provincial government can show the human ties that bound these disparate identities together, how these ties stretched and when they broke as the official world encountered the different realities and political imperatives of each region. It can show how the structures that Skinner's work has so powerfully uncovered entered the consciousness of those who had to deal with them. Indeed, the order in which China's provinces were enumerated in Qing official sources, reproduced in Table 1 provides some preliminary insights.

10 G. William Skinner, "Cities and the Hierarchy of Local Systems," in Skinner, editor, *The City in Late Imperial China*, pp. 281-282.

11 Skinner, "Regional Urbanization in China," in *ibid.*, p. 218.

12 The cases of the "tail" of Zhili, and the boundaries of the lower Yangzi valley provinces will be dealt in the book.

TABLE 1 Chinese Provinces As They Were Enumerated In Qing Sources

Zhili[13]
Shandong
Shanxi
Henan
Jiangsu
Anhui
Jiangxi
Fujian
Zhejiang
Hubei
Hunan
Shaanxi
Gansu[14]
Sichuan[15]
Guangdong
Guangxi
Yunnan
Guizhou

SOURCES: *Da Qing huidian*, p.29 (5); elaborated in *Da Qing huidian shili.* This is also the order in which prefectural and county officials are listed in *juan* 5 of *DQHD*, and the order in which provincial military establishments are enumerated in *DQHD* pp. 387-420 (*jüan* 43-45), elaborated in *DQHDSL*, volume 7, *passim*.

---

13 Zhili was not formally a province after 1723.

14 When Xinjiang was made a province, it was listed after Gansu. Gansu only existed as a province until 1757. See Chapter 3.

15 Sichuan only existed as a Qing province until 1767.

On first glance, the provinces appear to be listed in order of their proximity to the capital. However closer examination suggests other principles at work: for instance Shaanxi with its capital of Xian was closer to Beijing than Hunan with its capital at Changsha, yet Hunan is listed before Shaanxi in the chart. This is not accidental, for the break between Hunan and Shaanxi constituted the break between 'inner' provinces, as the Chinese sometimes called them, where the dynasty collected the bulk of its revenues, and the 'outer' provinces, where the majority of the dynasty's military forces were located. Conceptually the list reflected the fact that the tasks of governing these two types of provinces were different, a fact that was also reflected in institutional arrangements and in formal and informal appointment practices.

Within these two categories, proximity to the capital broadly prevailed. Among the 'outer' provinces, Shaanxi and the provinces of the northwest were listed first, followed by the Lingnan provinces, followed by the provinces of the southwest. The same is broadly true of the "inner" provinces, where the list moved from north China, to the lower Yangzi provinces to the southeast coast, then to the middle Yangzi. However, even within these constraints, a second sort of spatial anomaly can be observed. Fujian was farther from the capital than Zhejiang, and Yunnan farther from the capital than Guizhou, and yet Fujian and Yunnan are listed before Zhejiang and Guizhou. In fact, in these and every other case in the chart, provinces that contained the seat of a governor-general, the official who was senior to a provincial governor and usually responsible for military coordination in two or three provinces, were listed before the provinces that only had a governor. Distance from the capital was only one principle governing the enumeration of provinces, and perhaps the least important. More important were the sorts of tasks which government required in particular provinces and the way the

dynasty had organized space in order to perform these tasks.

Listing provinces served for the dynasty as a way of representing space, not as it could be measured or mapped, but as it was experienced. A second measure of how space was experienced, one that was more sensitive to changes over time in the nature of space and the challenges it posed, was the record of appointments made and the types of appointees sent to given postings. Here, of course, the Qing dynasty faced constraints. Qing rule was legitimate, in China that is, only to the extent that it was exercised in the name of universal principles. What was good for one region had to be good for another, and a distinction between provinces that was too apparent, lasted too long, or was unrelated to current realities would surely have undermined dynastic claims. Yet there were practical limits to evenhandedness, and there were also, from the dynasty's point of view, limits to the number of qualified and available personnel. There were in fact differences, consistent over decades if not over generations, in the depth and character of experience of appointees to provinces, and in the likelihood of being promoted to or from certain provinces. Measured, these differences proved to be significant, though not often radically. An official might have been twice as likely to have been promoted from one province than from another, or twice as likely to have been promoted to a certain province than another. Also interesting were the moments when the character of appointments to a province changed abruptly, as when civilian governors replaced military governors in Jiangsu after the Jiangnan Tax Riots of 1661, or in Hunan after that province began to serve as a breadbasket for the empire.

In view of the growing body of scholarship of single regions of China in English and the long tradition of such writing in Chinese and Japanese, it may seem an act of hubris, even academic imperialism, to propose to

consider all of China's provinces in a single account.[16] The object of what follows is not a critique or a synthesis of regional studies, but the more modest one of showing how and to what degree regional knowledge penetrated and shaped political consciousness, a goal that it best met through comparison. Moreover, as problems of administration often presented themselves more vividly in some regions than in others, the accounts in Parts II and III will each focus on one problem of administration. Chapter 7 will contrast the stable civilian order which was required to govern China's heartland, with the much more flexible policies which were needed to preserve the Qing defensive posture in the northwest and west. The issue here was not recognition of the differences between regions or the geo-political imperatives they entailed, for these were as readily apparent to the Qing as they would have been to any rulers of China. Rather the question was how to incorporate the several political formations of north and northwest China into one coherent polity. In some cases regional differences were accommodated by sending different sorts of men to govern; in other instances it was achieved through unique institutional arrangements. At some points in the history of the dynasty strategies changed, and with them boundaries and jurisdictions. Collectively, the provinces of the north and northwest demonstrated just how flexible the provincial order could be and when it broke under the strains of strategic need or economic and political change.

Chapter 8 will highlight the process of negotiation that was involved in the development of all Chinese provinces by examining the development of provincial institutions in the lower Yangzi valley. In Jiangsu and Anhui this

---

16 The regional literature is too extensive to be presented in one note here..

negotiation involved provincial boundaries and the jurisdictions they imposed, tax obligations, the politics of river control and the allocation of resources which it entailed, and the relationship of literati communities to the centers of political power. These issues surely arose in many other provinces as well, but the peculiar capacity of the Jiangnan elite to turn memory into history and ideology meant that the process of negotiation was more accessible in the lower Yangzi delta than elsewhere. Negotiations were also required along the southeast coast, examined in Chapter 8, but here the Qing encountered a far more multi-centered world with many more nodes(or in view of the way in which power was divided, nodules may be the better word) of political power than elsewhere. The early Qing government on the coast was far more variegated in its human and social constitution than Qing government elsewhere, displaying a diversity that was in some respects more characteristic of the pre-conquest Qing than of its later forms. The southeast coast provided a study in how the variety of the early, pre-conquest Qing period was transfromed into more regular social and political patterns of the imperial era. As this happened the two provinces on the coast, Zhejiang and Fujian, which were perceived in the seventeenth century to have much in common, grew apart, and came to follow very different paths.

The provinces south of the Yangzi have been set apart in Part Ⅲ because the political structures in the region were far more protean in the seventeenth century than north of the river. This is not to say that there weren't very real and powerful political forces south of the Yangzi. Rather, it was unclear in the middle seventeenth century how these forces, and the vast economic and social potentialities the region embodied, were to be incorporated into a centralized empire. Chapter 9 will examine the process by which the Qing transformed regions into provinces through its circulation of qualified

personnel; and the concomitant transformation of regional into political identities. In particular the Middle Yangzi, located in the center of the empire at the intersection of north-south and east-west routes, will show the character and success of the dynasty's policy of transferring officials from one jurisdiction to another. One characteristic of all the southern provinces was the untapped potential they had for dynamic development, and all throughout the southern provinces growth through the eighteenth century strained even the fairly new administrative structures evolved in the seventeenth. The far south of China was perhaps the region of China most marked by extraordinary and growing differences of wealth in the eighteenth century, and Chapter 10 will examine how the Qing political order dealt with these disparities. Chapter 11 will examine how new means of communication changed the character of political relations between the far southwest and the capital. The issue was not so much the integrations of the region into the empire, for as several recent studies have shown, this was accomplished through military conquest and peaceful development. Rather the question is how new media of communication allowed the court to become more aware, and perhaps also more in control, of developments in the farthest reaches of the empire.

One reason why the differences among Qing provinces have not been fully explored is that the dynasty was particularly successful at naturalizing them. All governments, particularly imperial systems, are faced with the task of making their structures of rule appear normal, making the instruments of control seem both normal and necessary. In spite of the fact that province-sized entities had existed in China for centuries, they had never become the focus of primordial attachments on the part of Chinese subjects, who were far more likely to associate themselves with their native districts or with the

empire as a whole than with intervening territorial units[17]. It was beyond the capacities of the considerable image making apparatus of the Qing dynasty to make change such a vision, nor was it entirely desirable to do so, since in so doing the dynasty could have produced alternative political centers in competition with the state. But it was important for the dynasty to legitimate the political structures through which most of the state's business was transacted at the local level. This was done in a small way by referring to provinces by abbreviations that referred to historical events or geographical features in which local residents could justifiably take pride. Perhaps more important, late imperial government borrowed a genre from elite culture to describe structures of provincial rule. The local gazetteer(*fang zhi*)had become by late Ming times the favored way in which the local elites of China had described their accomplishments and the landmarks of their social and communal life. During the eighteenth century, the Qing dynasty ordered provincial governments to prepare provincial level gazetteers incorporating at least some of the same information, organized in the same categories, as privately published county gazetteers. Provincial gazetteers opened with a section, which was sometimes treated as a preface, in which the most important imperial edicts concerning the province were reprinted. Subsequent sections dealt with the physical and administrative geography of the province, an account of the political institutions set out within its boundaries, and a description of the society governed. The last section usually highlighted local notables who had passed the examination or become famous and listed local monuments and literary and artistic achievements. In effect, imperial

---

17 See the interesting reflections on primordial attachments and provincial narratives in Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*, pp. 177-204, particularly pp. 178-179.

pronouncements were set out as the precondition for rule and the institutions of provincial government were inserted, as bridge and facilitator, between the natural environment and the human realm.[18]

It would be a vast exaggeration, of course, to claim that governors formed the glue that held the Chinese Empire together. Military conquest, economic complementarity, and even the cultural conception of China as a whole were far more important forces. But governors certainly did articulate the understandings of regional significance that proved the working basis of a unified administration. When Tian Wenjing wrote about the significance of the Yellow River or the governors of Yunnan and Guizhou wrote of how vast distances impeded the capacity of southwestern officials to act in accordance with the will of the central government, they were setting forth data on which understandings and actions were to be based. Conversely, when officials carried administrative paradigms from one province or one region to another, they defined the nature of the empire for those they ruled. In both cases, it was the territorial officials who mapped the empire for subordinates and superiors as they traveled along its highways and byways.

C. The Governors

The proposition that a study of provincial governors would illumine the

---

18 Provincial gazetteers used in the account below will be listed in the notes. It should be noted that unlike county gazetteers there was little information in provincial gazetteers that was not available else where, and much of the information in provincial accounts suffered from the process of redaction. The volumes have some value as finding aids for information whose accuracy may need to be confirmed from other sources, but they speak more vividly of the provincial images that the dynasty sought to portray.

structure of the Qing state, and the way in which the state conceived of and integrated the regions of empire would seem to require little defense. What may require more defense is the use of personnel records and the biographical materials to which they were linked, to approach the subject of provincial government in China. The objection here would not be to the use of biographical material in general, but specifically to the Chinese variety. Chinese biographies were rather specialized works, usually written on the occasion of their subject's death, at the moment when the decedent passed from history into memory.[19] As such they were hardly appropriate vehicles to reflect their subjects' subjectivities. On the other hand, biographical writing such as the Chinese practiced it was a well established genre in Chinese history which, taken together with writings in chronological and topical form, constituted one of the three primary forms of historical writing. Biographies preserved documents, memorials and letters, and snippets of gossip that escaped from other types of source materials. Perhaps as important, biographies preserved snapshots of what aspects of an individual's life were perceived by his contemporaries as worth preserving, and which sets of connections and personal ties seemed most salient to those who had survived. Surely no one would set out to write a study of "life and times" in this age when Foucault has redefined the meaning of life and Braudel as restructured our notion of times. But neither should one approach the history of policy making in China without a healthy recognition of the role of human contingency.

The first task, however, is to establish who governed and where. Historians of monarchical appointments in other empires are somewhat more

19 In Fruitful Sites, *A Study of Garden Culture in the Ming*, p. 104, Craig Clunas has more appropriately termed these materials "necrologies;" I continue here to call them biographies for expository convenience.

fortunate than historians of late imperial China. In other realms, memoirs and correspondence, in some cases even letters of appointment revealed the circumstances of individual appointments. In China, these materials had much more limited value. While imperial comments on the occasion on a governor's appointment were not uncommon in China, they were often tantalizingly brief. Moreover, the extant records of words spoken at Qing court were not, in a strict sense, primary sources, being rather edited materials produced significantly after the events they purport to describe. Unable to rely on what emperors said, we must rely on what emperors did. Fortunately the facts of imperial appointments in China were well documented. Every appointment of an official to the office of provincial governor was announced by an edict, and these edicts, arranged chronologically, were published as the *Qing shilu*, or *Veritable Records* of the dynasty. These edicts have been indexed in a project led by Qian Shifu and his colleagues at Beijing University that was completed in 1963. The results were published in 1980 as *Qingdai zhiguan nianbiao*(4 volumes, Zhonghua shuju, Beijing). The record of provincial appointments in volume three of this index is nearly complete; in rare instances sources other than imperial edicts were used to establish information. As a record of appointments, the *Shilu* entries were far more complete than either the accounts in provincial gazetteers or the "Treatise on Officials of the *Qing shi gao*," produced in the early twentieth century. The *Shilu* record of appointments tells us what the court intended, but it also inadvertently shows when the court's intentions were frustrated by deaths, emergencies, political crises, leaves, mourning, or other circumstances.[20]

---

20 What often resulted in these cases were hasty appointments, rapid transfers, and unusual changes in personnel, which were more revealing of the situation at court than in the provinces. See the analysis in Chapter 4 of very short appointments and the circumstances which provoked them.

This material has been used in the following study in two ways.[21] In the seventeenth century, before the provincial order was fully evolved, the entries in *QDZGNB* have been used to establish who in fact governed where and when. Once this is established, biographical materials have been used to establish careers, connections and policy emphases. Since the provinces in these early years were very different realms, comparisons among them must proceed qualitative rather than quantitative terms. Once the territorial system was fully evolved, and provinces became more consistent units of the imperial order, it became possible to collect comparable data on each appointment. For convenience, the year 1700 is used below as the date to begin comparisons. Any date is of course suspiciously arbitrary, particularly one which is drawn from the western calendar. But by this year in China, the great rebellion of Wu Sangui in the south had ended and most provinces had achieved their final form, and changes in personnel procedures in the capital made it more likely that officials could move readily from province to province. For the nearly 1500 appointments made between 1700 and 1900, which I have taken as the beginning of twentieth century reforms, tabulated the name of the appointee, the dates of his service, the length of time he served, and his ethnicity-Chinese, Mongol or Manchu. In addition, it is possible to establish the nature of each governor's appointment, whether by

21 I am grateful for successive grants from the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, and its China Program, which have made possible a computer-assisted study of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century appointments. I am also grateful the assistance of Andrew Eisenberg, Li Yi, Patrick Walsh, and Dai Yingcong for their assistance in the endlessly tedious process of recording, encoding, and rechecking these data. I am also grateful for a summer stipend from the National Endowment for the Humanities, awarded in the summer of 1987, which made possible a preliminary analysis of these data.

promotion, lateral transfer, or special appointment(for definition of these terms, see Chapter 2), and the character of the official's departure from office. The modes of departure included unforeseen circumstances--illness or death, the death of a parent, and the required period of mourning this entailed--or political circumstances--summons to the capital, relief of responsibility, demotion or cashiering--and routine actions--promotion or lateral transfer. Collectively these data allow us to measure the court's intentions; biographical materials demonstrate what was actually accomplished.

A prosopographic approach to Chinese governors affords an opportunity to examine a group of Chinese officials who have hitherto received little study. Chinese governors were men at the middle of their careers, men who were usually between 40 and 60 years of age, and who were 10 to 30 years past their first entry into government service.[22] Those governors were appointed directly by the emperor tended to be somewhat younger, and those who had worked their way up the ladder of promotion tended to be somewhat older at the time of their first appointment. But all were men for whom the commitments and convictions of youth had matured into a capacity for action, and the records of their careers served to demonstrate the range of actions of which officials were capable. In so far as the history of governors' administration displays a range of actions actually undertaken by a fairly well documented group, it differs from most existing histories. Both Chinese and Western historians have written about exceptional individuals,

22 Unfortunately biographies are not specific enough about age to permit more refined demographic analysis. In perhaps a quarter of the cases, age is given, but in most instances one can know only the date on which a governor took civil service exams or entered the government service, and in many instances this date is only an approximation.

men like Cao Xuejin[23], Yuan Mei[24], Zhang Xuecheng[25], and Chen Hongmou, whose accomplishments struck their contemporaries and successors as so extraordinary and instructive that they deserved to be retold in detail. At the same time, cultural historians have sought to establish the groundwork of assumptions that underlay official accomplishments. Among these are certainly Thomas Metzgar's masterful analysis of the regulations governing administrative discipline in the Qing, and the assumptions they revealed about the nature of human fallibility and the human actions needed to over come it. Equally indispensable is Benjamin Elman's sweeping and compelling account of the late imperial civil service examination system. But neither the record of the exceptional, nor the analysis of de-personalized norms can adequately convey the world of those who actually governed.

Qing governors provide a nice group to study this world, since their lives were relatively well documented. Most were the subjects of "working biographies"(*ben zhuan*) prepared by the state historiographical commission shortly after their death. The *primary* role of the commission, which was staffed by members of the imperial Hanlin Academy, was to prepare the official version of the orders issued by each emperor that was known as the *Veritable Records*(*Shi Lu*) of the reign. But in addition, the commission prepared biographies of the most important officials. These were for the most part rather dry accounts, but they preserved dates and details of an official's service that are unavilable elsewhere. As important, these working biographies

23 Jonathan D. Spence, *Ts'ao Yin and the K'ang-hsi Emperor: Bondservant and Master.*

24 Arthur Waley, *Yuan Mei, An Eighteenth-Century Chinese Poet.* Despite its apparent focus on poetry, this volume is useful for the study of political history, since Yuan Mei was extremely well connected and seems to have been something of a gossip.

25 David S. Nivison, *Life and Thought of Chang Hsüeh-ch'eng, 1738-1901.*

preserved the texts of their subjects' most important official writings. These included policy memorials submitted through the public channel, and hence not readily available elsewhere, as well as secret memorials that may or may not have survived in the archives of the dynasty. In addition to these official sources, there were for some governors at least epitaphs and reminiscences prepared by friends, associates, or admirers at the time of their death. The quality and availability of these writings varied widely. There were for instance none who wished to remember the life of Tian Wenjing, who was the longest serving governor of Henan province in the Qing; his lower class origin, innovative approaches, and brusque administrative style earned the admiration of few of the literary men who wrote epitaphs. On the other hand, Zhang Boxing who self-consciously took upon the task of serving as cultural bridge between the court and the Jiangnan literati, was celebrated repeatedly in private epitaphs. Even where epitaphs exist they have to be read cautiously, for although such writings conventionally opened with a statement of the relationship between the author and the subject, much of the interest in these episodes they narrated were essentially gossip which cannot be authenticated from other sources.

A third type of biography, often halfway between official biography and private epitaph, were the accounts preserved in the draft history of the Qing, printed in 1927-28. These accounts, of course, have their inaccuracies, and there have been a variety of attempts, conducted on both sides of the Taiwan Straits to correct them. But what makes them interesting for present purposes is the comparative perspective they often entailed. The advantage of these biographies is that the editors of the collection were in a position to compare the individuals they wrote about, drawing on materials from different times and places, in a way that few historians of the twentieth century have been

able to do. Occasionally the results of their comparisons are incorporated in a single biography, as is the case in their account of Bian Sanyuan, one of the first Qing governors of Guizhou, whose historical significance was debated until the late eighteenth century. More often the judgements of the editors of the *Qing shi gao* were expressed rather more obliquely in the order in which individuals were considered. The disadvantage of *Qing shi gao* is that it is informed by an early-twentieth-century vernacular narrative of Qing dynasty history, a Republican period understanding of the Qing past which must as often be deconstructed as accepted. But even when such a narrative exists, it can often constitute a datum evidence of how the past was remembered.[26]

The governors who emerge from these various biographical portraits were hardly the corrupt and effete mandarins of twentieth-century imagining. They were rather a remarkably interconnected group of men prepared by their experience and social station to take up positions of responsibility in the name of the Qing and execute their responsibilities in accord with the standards of the society they lived in and the state they served. In fact, many of them were not "mandarins" at all, if by that much ill-used term is meant holders of official *Jin-shi* degrees. Overall, fewer than half the Qing provincial governors were degree holders; even under the Qianlong Emperor who prided himself on a reign in which knowledge and power were conjoined, only 26% of the governors held the degree. There were of course places, like Jiangsu in the last years of the seventeenth and first years of the eighteenth centuries; and times like the late Kangxi reign and the years following the crisis of provincial government in the mid-Qianlong period, when degree holding was very

26 Biographical accounts of governors preserved in provincial gazetteers, in which editors produced on imperial command accounts of the most prominent governors in the province, are also useful, though epistemologically incomplete.

important for governors. But except for these moments when certain types of appointments were meant to make a political and cultural statement, governors inhabited a stratum of Chinese officialdom in which accomplishment, or perhaps more precisely a perceived capacity for accomplishment, was more important than any single objective qualification for office.

But if there was no single qualification for governor's office how was the court to distinguish among the many whose names might be presented for office? Many procedures were established and they will be reviewed at some length below, but they all operated within a world of assumptions about how talents were nurtured and capacities developed. Not surprisingly, family mattered. In the appendix to this chapter are listed 63 eighteenth-century governors whose fathers, sons, uncles, nephews, or cousins also served as provincial governors. The names listed represented 16% of the 387 men appointed as governor in the eighteenth century. The list is not exhaustive; biographical materials are far more likely to mention direct male descendants, than they are to refer to more distant relationships in the male line or to affinal or other family ties which almost certainly existed among serving officials in the Qing. A close examination of governors' families, if it were possible, would probably reveal that twice as many governors, perhaps as many as a third of those appointed, were related to other governors. Some of the families on the list were ones that had enjoyed prominence for many generations in Qing China. Fan Shichong, Fan Shijie and Fan Shishou were the last descendants of Fan Wencheng, the putative architect of the Qing order who was said to have drafted the document in which the Manchus announced their intent to conquer China, to serve in the Qing state.[27] Aligun

---

27 On Fan Wencheng and his son Fan Chengmo, see Chapter 8. Biographies of the

and Tsereng were the grandsons of Ebilun who participated in the Qing conquest and served as a regent for the young Kangxi emperor. Their father Yinde was a trusted subordinate of the Kangxi Emperor who accompanied him on his campaign against Galdan.[28] Other families, however, had not been prominent for nearly so long. Ortai emerged from the relative obscurity of a lower banner position to become a confidant of the Yongzheng; three of his sons and two nephews became provincial governors.[29] The Yang family who provided governors and governors general in south China for three generations, emerged at roughly the same time. Some families' reputations were founded on the civil service degrees or competent service of their scions.[30] Xu Chao first earned the attention of the emperor through his scholarly eminence and, in fact, tutored the Kangxi Emperor in the *Yijing*.[31] His term was fondly remembered in Henan, and his son was appointed a generation later to govern Shaanxi. Wu Shaoshi became known especially for his legal expertise, which at least one of his sons shared, and the three served in various provinces in the later eighteenth century.[32]

(续)

members of the Fan family who served the Qing State are found in *juan* 253 of *QSG*, V, p. 3823-24, and in *juan* 283 of *GCJXLZ*.

28 On Aligun and Tsereng, see *QSG*, VI, pp. 4212 and 4217, and "(Aligun)Ben zhuan" in *GCJXLZ* 27.14a-22b. On Ebilun and Yinde, see *QSG*, V, pp.3806-7, *ECCP*, p. 219, and Qxnam, *Ruling From Horseback*, pp.17-28; a great grandaughter of Aligun became the Daoguang Emperor's empress.

29 On Ortai, see Chapter 11. Son's and nephews of Ortai are treated in *juan* 289 of *QSG*, V, pp. 4030-33. Several received entries in *GCJXLZ*.

30 Yang Zongren and his father Yang Wenqian are treated in *juan* 298 of *QSG*, V, pp. 4061-3; both are the subjects of entries in *juan* 165 of *GCJXLZ*. Yang Yingju is treated in *juan* 328 of *QSG*, VI, p. 4298. They are discussed in Chapters 6, 8 and 9.

31 Xu Chao and his son Xu Qi are treated in *juan* 277 of *QSG*, V, p. 3962.

32 The Wu family are discussed in *juan* 322 of *QSG*, VI, p. 4253. They are discussed in Chapters 8 and 12.

Blood relationships of the sort that prevailed among many governors were not unusual in the Qing empire, and there were positions that were inherited. Evelyn Rawski's research on the Qing imperial family has suggested the importance of the geneological principle there, and among members of the Qing military forces where ranks could be inherited, and it is perhaps not surprising that those with inherited military rank moved into the ranks of provincial administration. In the case of governors, however, there can have been no question of entitlement. Indeed if appointments had been merely a matter of pedigree, there would have been many other families who would have had claims on territorial office. Some process of selection was certainly going on, albeit one that lead repeatedly to the same families. Some clue to the nature of the process is suggested by the fact that some posts saw more appointments of relatives than others. More relatives were appointed to the governorship of Shandong than any other province. In river administration, sons very often succeeded fathers in the eighteenth century. Zhang Boxing and his son Zhang Shizai; Gaojin, his father Gao'e and son Shuchang; He Wei and his son He Yücheng all served in succession.[33] There was no question of these postings constituting fiefdoms, although sons could certainly make productive use of the networks of contacts and relationships their fathers had built up. What one inherited in Qing China was not so much claim to territories or posts, as the interest and sympathy of a court that sought trustworthy intermediaries in its contacts with a vast empire and complex civil service. At best one can say that the presence of a father and son, or brothers in the same positions suggested the degree to which the court

33 *QSG* comments on the frequency of father-son succession in river administration at the conclusion of *juan* 326, p. 4292.

personalized the postings, turning to men it knew to govern regions they knew. As Chapter 4 will demonstrate, the Qing went far further than many previous dynasties to craft a relatively neutral system of personnel evaluation and appointments, but modern though this system appeared, it was never meant to attack fundamental assumptions about Chinese society. One of these assumption was that family ties were always more reliable than the ties of political association or rule making.

No system that relied as heavily on family personal relations as the Chinese bureaucratic order could escape what Ray Huang has so elegantly termed activities of "twilight legitimacy."[34] The aptness of Huang's phrasing lies in the fact that it conveys, with delicious irony, the difficulties of using twentieth-century terminology to characterize late-imperial-Chinese bureaucratic behavior as corrupt or upright. In a sense, the existence of what would be termed corrupt by the twentieth century was the price the Qing had to pay for the system of government it implemented. Corruption in some measure was a given, but there were also governors whose corrupt activities exceeded tolerable limits, and their numbers seemed to grow as the eighteenth century progressed. With reason the middle years of the century have become known for the corruption of territorial administration.[35] Even the *Qing shi gao*, relatively sympathetic to the Qing, devoted three *juan* to the biographies of eighteenth-century governors who lost careers or lives through accusations of

34 Ray Huang, *1587: A Year of No Significance*.

35 Most studies of the eighteenth century take this is a given. For some recent work on the subject, see Nancy Elizabeth Park, "Corruption and Its Recompense: Bribes, Bureaucracy, and the Law in Late Imperial China"(Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1993); and Ma Qihua, *Qing Gaozong chao zhi tanke an*(Taipei: Huagang, 1974).

corruption or incompetence.[36] The politics of incompetence in Qing China was surely as complicated as it was in any sophisticated bureaucratic order, but there may have been reasons why governors during the eighteenth century in particular were corrupt. In the long Qianlong reign, the pathways to power became especially well known and well worn; the relative consistency of power holders during the reign highlighted the network of personal relations that always undergirded Chinese governments. Also, as the empire became more prosperous, more money passed through official hands. By the middle of the eighteenth century, a governor of one of China's coastal provinces might handle salt revenues, commercial taxes, and even customs revenues that were far in excess of what predecessors had dealt with. Such a governor also had personal access to amounts of revenues that enabled him to pay fines that were ten to fifteen times his yearly nourishment of virtue salaries.[37]

But it is also necessary to distinguish between the reasons why governors were corrupt, and the reasons why corruption became such a central element in the political discourse of the eighteenth century. Two factors the rise of the secret, palace memorial and the interwoven character of the eighteenth-century provincial governors' corps conspired to make accusations a much more common feature of political life in the eighteenth century than they had been in the seventeenth. The secret memorial was itself an invention of the Qing, created to foster more direct personal communication between the monarchs and their territorial representatives than routine means of communication allowed. Initially, the secret memorials

36 *QSG*, *Juan* 338-340, VI, pp. 4366-4380.

37 See the documents on fines assessed by the Imperial Household Department, discussed in Chapter 9.

were used to report weather and the quality of grain harvests, but emperors soon urged officials to use their memorials to report on other officials' actions and capacities. The genre has been much admired by historians, who must rely on memorials for much of what is known about local government in the Qing. Beatrice Bartlett's superb monograph on the development of the Grand Council has shown how the new flow of documents changed Qing central government institutions, but few have looked in a more analytical way at how the existence of the memorial changed the character of political life in China. As will be argued in chapter 10, the secret memorial in a sense added to the frustrations of the monarch by providing him with more detailed information about local conditions, without adding to his ability to control them. In fact, as Philip Kuhn has argued, one of the weapons a bureaucrat in Qing China was to overwhelm to monarch with documents. In the matter of official behavior, the existence of a secret memorial system and the opportunities for protected inter-personal accusation that it afforded may well have encouraged accusations, and the absence of rules in secret memorials against hearsay evidenced added fuel to the fire. In effect the existence of the palace memorial system created something of a crisis of accusations, some true and, predictably enough, some false. As Chapter 9, Part 4 will argue, one consequence of all these new accusations was the evolution of a new and more subtly nuanced system of punishments for officials. At one extreme in this scheme, a variety of mechanisms were evolved whereby an offical could make amends for his mistake, with limited impact on his official career. At the other extreme, exile and executions of officials found guilty became more common in the eighteenth century than they had been in earlier times.

Accusations represented half of the story; the other half was the way in

which the eighteenth-century monarchy responded to accusations. The code gave the emperor considerably leeway in dealing with charges of official misbehavior, and within this leeway different monarchs evolved different styles. The Yongzheng Emperor preserved his freedom of action by first relieving an accused official of responsibility, then investigating his misdeeds, and only at a later date assessing them. The Qianlong Emperor was much more public in his response. He usually announced by edict that a charge had been made, appointed by edict officials to investigate them, commented on various phases of the investigation, and announced outcomes publicly. The result of this was that a massive amount of documentation about official behavior was entered into the public record. One recent collection of documents on corruption has reprinted over 2400 documents from only 17 corruption cases, mostly involving provincial governors.[38] If all of this represented a strategy to proclaim the probity of the dynasty, it was a flawed one, for evidence in the very edicts declaring the dynasty's vigilance undermined the claims. In fact, all this publicity only made sense if one assumed that, in effect, the cat of corruption was out of the bag, and that many knew or needed to know about the corrupt activities that had occurred. This was plausible since many governors were, if not family then at least friends of the family, a group of men well acquainted with each other who would well know each others' weaknesses and who was inclined to indulge weaknesses to excess. Moreover, in the rather mobile officialdom, cases usually could not be investigated in one province; evidence had to be sought in the accused official's former postings, in his home county, and often in the

38 *Qianlong chao zhengban danwu xuanbian*, 4 Volumes(Beijing: Zhonghuan Shuju, 1993).

yamens of his former subordinates and superiors. If officials didn't know of each other's corruption, they were certain soon to find out.

This meant that officials read the imperial edicts on corruption not for the information they contained but for the imperial reactions they expressed, and the implications these reactions might have for future bureaucratic practice and malpractice. It is important to read the massive documentation on official corruption not only as a commentary on individual failings, although it certainly was that, but also as part of a discourse on political practice in the official community. Punishments were, to be sure, made to fit the crime, but also made to fit the community. Commenting on the punishments in corruption cases, the *Qing shi gao* wrote: "Law is that through which the peace is maintained in the world. The potential official watches actual officials, knowing where in his behavior is unlike theirs. Then he takes the loves and hatreds, joys and angers of the day and submits them to law in order to follow them. This is not a minor matter."[39] Or again, justifying the fact that the Qianlong Emperor punished not only corrupt officials but also their families, the history writes, "once the stream is muddied, it is impossible to make it clear again."[40] No one in the eighteenth century would have separated acts of corruption from the real political, social, and human context in which they occurred, and it is perhaps inappropriate to try to do so today. The corruption cases of the eighteenth century certainly highlight vividly, in some instances even luridly, the temptations to which eighteenth-century governors were prey. But they also demonstrate the extent to which the mid-Qing governors had come to function as a community, a development that was

39 *QSG*, p. 4369, concluding comment on *juan* 338.

40 *QSG*, p. 4381, concluding comment on *juan* 340.

itself the product of nearly a century of dynastic-institution building.

Dwelling on the corruption of the eighteenth century, historians run the risk of neglecting the many more governors who fulfilled the dynasty's expectations than disappointed them. In fact, in every generation of the Qing, there were governors who earned praise from contemporaries and historians for the diligent fulfillment of the role of territorial servants. The *Qing shi gao* is useful in identifying these governors, both because it incorporated collective memory, and because the offering up of good and bad models was its explicit purpose. The characterizations of the *QSG* were often as interesting for what they said about the tasks of an era, as about the men who accomplished them. The last half of the Kangxi reign, really the first generation in which provincial governors functioned as arms of the Qing civilian government (as opposed to being the coordinators of military occupation) was remembered in later years as the age of heroes. Three governors of this era--Yü Chenglong and Shi Shilun in the lower Yangzi valley and Peng Peng on the southeast coast--acquired enduring reputations for frugality, and bravery.[41] In all three cases, the stories were preserved for nearly two hundred years and written down in popular novels in the nineteenth century. *An Inquiry into the Cases of Lord Yü*, was probably written down as early as the middle of the eighteenth century; *The Cases of Lord Shi* was published in 1838, and The *Cases of Lord Peng* published in 1891. By the time they were published, of course, the tales recorded in these books probably bore limited relationship to the actual lives of these officials. Nonetheless, they attracted enormous attention: despite the fact that the originals were written in what Lu Xun termed "atrocious Chinese," no less

41 *QSG*, *juan* 278, V, pp. 3968-3973.

that ten sequels to *The Cases of Lord Shi*, and seventeen sequels to *The Cases of Lord Peng* were published in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century.[42] Less spectacular, but perhaps more important, were a group of provincial governors who labored quietly in the late-Kangxi years to restore the balance between military and civilian rule, "preserving peace without forgetting danger," and addressing issues in the tax regime. Neither of these matters was finally resolved, but governors like Xu Chao in Henan from 1700-1704, Jiang Chenxi in Shandong from 1700-1708, and Shi Lin all earned the respect of those they governed and those they served. In each case, their sons served as governors in their stead.[43]

The succeeding reign of the Yongzheng Emperor was the great age of activism, when governors like Tian Wenjing, Ortai and Li Wei, reflecting their monarch's will but often leading the way on specific policy matters, transformed the character of provincial government. Because Yinzhen, the man who reigned as the Yongzheng Emperor was such an unusual and colorful monarch, there has always been a tendency in historical accounts to attribute the reforms of his reign to the initiatives of the throne. There is truth to this, for the emperor's dissatisfactions reasonate loudly through the historical documentation. But provincial reform under Yongzheng was really the product of a partnership between a monarch who was willing to entertain innovation and provincial governors who knew where and how to innovate. Many participated in the process of reform, and some even carried the process further than a restless but ever-anxious monarch would have wished. Tian Wenjing in Henan, Ortai in the southwest, Xiande in Sichuan, Yinjishan

42 Lu Xun, *Short History of Chinese Fiction*, Trans. Gladys Yang and Yang Xianyi, pp. 348-9, 418-9.

43 *QSG, juan* 277, V, pp. 3961-68.

in Jiangsu, and Li Wei in Zhili all led rather charmed bureaucratic lives and contributed to the successes of the reign. On the other hand, Tian Wenjing's subordinates Wang Shijun and Yang Wenqian probably pushed the limits of activism when they served in Guangdong; and Ortai's subordinates Zhang Guangxi and Zhang Yunsui intensified the military conquests of the southwest, converting what was conceived in the Yongzheng years as a project of "pacification" of non-Han peoples into a rout. All of these governors, and perhaps Tian Wenjing as well, were in a sense too ambitious, not for themselves personally but for the Qing state, and pushed projects that were beyond the capacities of contemporary statecraft.[44]

In view of the achievements of many early Qing governors, it is tempting to view the governors of the early-Qianlong period as a generation of epigones. Several powerful provincial officials from the Yongzheng era, like Yinjishan in the lower Yangzi valley and Zhang Yunsui and Zhang Guangxi in the southwest, continued to serve well into the eighteenth century and many of the early-Qianlong appointees were sons and brothers of previous provincial leaders. Included among these were all the sons and nephews of Ortai, as well as nearly half of the sons and descendants listed in Appendix A. But there were also many who built on the foundations of provincial institutions established in the seventeenth and eighteenth century to extend the range and capacities of the Qing state. Among the most famous of these was Chen Hongmou whose combination of scholarly commitment and administrative abilities recommended him to contemporaries and successors as a model provincial governor. But there were others as well who

44 *QSG*, *juan* 295, V, pp. 4073-4080 reflects on this phenomenon, though the biographies of Zhang Yunsui and Zhang Guangxi are found elsewhere..

contributed to the stability of the mid-eighteenth century. Fang Guancheng in Zhili developed famine relief systems, and Yang Xifu monitored the buildings of dikes and waterworks in Hunan and then moved on to manage the grain distribution system in central China. Korjishan dealt with corruption in the northwest and then became the Minzhe governor-general; his son Dingchang was appointed governor of Fujian the month his father died. "The achievements of eighteenth century may seem to have been minor matters," wrote the *Qing shi gao* "but in fact they were the most urgent tasks of eighteenth-century officialdom."[45] Even in the last half of the Qianlong reign, which is probably better known for being the age of rising corruption associated with Heshen, there were those who resisted corruption and maintained the order earlier established. Among these were the cohort of Li Hu, which included Bi Yuan, who expanded Chinese-style administration in Shaanxi; Zhou Yuanli the first to confront the consequences of economic decline north China; and Liang Guozhi, the "silver-haired mandarin" who met Lord Macartney on his trip from Tianjin to the heavenly capital in 1796.

Catalogs of the competent are never as compelling as the foibles of the foolish. It may be futile to try and distinguish the two groups even for heuristic purposes, as the *Qing shi gao* tries to do, for ultimately all belonged to the same political culture. If governors constituted a community, as I have argued they did, it was surely not a community set apart from the society it governed. Much as the Qing emperors would have liked to imagine territorial officials as a group whose receipt of imperial grace(in the form of an appointment) inoculated them against the temptations of lesser men, governors varied in the capacity to administer affairs and resist the temptations

45 *QSG*, p. 4180, conclusion to *juan* 299.

of wealth and station. Nonetheless, the presence of powerful and capable territorial officials in nearly every Qing generation points to the importance of the group whom it is the purpose of this book to study, and of the political system which produced them. The analysis below examines governors and the institutional in which they lived in several stages. Part I will examine the institutional foundations laid down for territorial governors in the seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries. Chapter 1 will examine the often rather melancholy precedents for provincial government from the early and middle imperial periods. Chapter 2 will show what the Qing dynasty did with those precedents, how by inspired tinkering the dynasty evolved what was arguably the central political institution of its territorial regime. This new regime forced the Qing to confront rather more directly than had previous dynasties the conundrum of competence, the question of how to assess the abilities of those serving in office; the dynasty's response to this challenge will be examined in Chapter 3. Part Two will examine the process of provincial elaboration, the way in which the Qing dynasty fit its territorial template to the peculiar circumstances of each region. Chapters 7, 8 and 9 will treat north and northwest China, the lower Yangzi valley and the southeast coast, and Chapters 10, and 11 will look at the middle Yangzi, the Lingnan region and China's southwest. Chapters 6 and 13 will present closer studies of individual governorships. Chapter 6 will examine the appointment of Tian Wenjing and the tensions of Qing rule in north China. Chapter 13 will trace the career of Li Hu who moved from the bottom of the system to the top in the later half of the eighteenth century. A concluding chapter will attempt to measure the dynasty's achievement in establishing territorial order and consider its strengths and weakness on the eve of China's great nineteenth-century winter of discontent.

Fathers and Sons:
Some Families in the Eighteenth-Century Chinese Governors' Corps

Family Members	Governorships[46]
Celeng	Guangdong 1744-45
	Governor-general 1745-53
Brother Aligun	Shanxi 1743-46
	Shandong 1746-48
	Shanxi 1748-50
	Governor-general 1750-53
Chen Dashou	Anhui, 1739-1741
	Jiangsu 1741-1746
	Fujian 1746-47
Son Chen Huizu	Guangxi 1769-71
	Hubei 1771-79
	Zhejiang 1781-82
Bulantai	Hunan 1725-27
	Jiangxi 1727-28
Son Yonggui	Zhejiang 1749-51
Chen Xian	Guizhou 1705-08
	Huguang 1708-1711
Son Chen Shiguan	Shandong 1724-1726
Cousin Chen Yuanlong	Guangxi 1711-1718
Ortai	
Nephew Echang	Guangxi 1746-48
	Gansu 1748-51
	Jiangxi 1751-52
	Gansu 1754-55

46 In a number of instances, very short terms have been elminated from this list.

Nephew Eleshun	Gansu 1752-54
	Anhui 1754-55
	Shandong 1755-56
Son Erongan	Henan 1748-51
	Shandong 1751-52
	Jiangxi 1752-53
	Governor-general 1753-54
Son Ebi	Shanxi 1759-62
	Shaanxi 1762-63
	Governor-general 1762
Son Ening	Hubei 1766-67
	Yunnan 1767-68
	Fujian 1768-69
Gaojin[47]	Anhui 1755-1761
	Governor-general 1761-1769
Shulin	Anhui 1784-87
	Governor-general 1787-1790
	Shanxi 1790-91
	Governor-general 1791-94
Fan Shichong	Guangdong 1705-1709
Cousin Fan Shijie	Shanxi 1723-25
Cousin Fan Shishou	Hunan 1751-53
	Jiangxi 1752-55
	Hubei 1767
Huang Bingzhong	Zhejiang 1708-1710
	Fujian 1710-1711
Huang Tinggui	Gansu 1741-1748

47 Gaojin's father, Gao'e served as Director-general of River Conservancy for the Northern Rivers from 1741-47, and Director-general of River Conservancy for Southern Rivers from 1747-53.

	Governor-general 1748-1759
Grandson Huang Jian	Fujian 1778-79
He Wei	Henan 1771-74
Son He Yucheng	Henan 1783-85
	Jiangxi 1785-90
Jiang Chenxi	Shandong 1708-1716
Nephew Jiang Pu[48]	Hunan 1743-4
Nephew Jiang Zhou	Shandong 1755
Korjishan	Shanxi 1740-42
	Anhui 1742-43
	Shandong 1743-46
	Governor-general 1757-1761
Dingchang	Guangxi 1751-52
	Guizhou 1753-57
	Fujian 1761-66
	Governor-general 1766-68
Nian Jialing	Huguang, 1692-1704
Nian Gengyao	Sichuan 1709-21
Nian Xiyao	Guangdong 1722-25
Pei Ludi	Jiangxi 1723-26
Son Pei Zongxi	Anhui 1770-75
	Guizhou 1775-77
	Yunnan 1777-79
Shi Lin	
Son Shi Wensheng	Yunnan 1694-1704
	Guangdong 1704-05
? Shi Wenzhuo	Henan 1723-25

48 Jiang Pu and Jiang Zhou were the sons of Jiang Tingxi, one of the early grand councillors

	Gansu 1725-27
Shi Liha (son of Shi Wenzhuo)	Guangdong 1727-28
Shuose	Shaanxi 1734-37
	Sichuan 1737-1739
	Shandong 1739-1740
	Henan 1740
Son Fusong	Zhejiang 1782-86, 1790-92
Wenshou	Shanxi 1768-71
	Governor-general
Son Guotai	Shandong 1777-1782
Wu Shaoshi	Jiangxi 1766-69
Son Wu Tan	Jiangsu 1780
Son Wu Yuan	Guangxi 1784-85
	Hubei 1785-86
Yu Chenglong (1)	Zhili 1686-1690
	Governor-general 1700
Son Yu Jun	Guizhou 1704-05
	Jiangsu, 1705-09
Xuyuanmeng	Zhejiang 1714-1717
Grandson Shuchang[49]	Guizhou 1779-1780
Xu Chao	Henan 1700-04
Xu Qi	Shaanxi 1746-47
Yang Zongren	Guangxi 1718-22
	Governor-general 1725
Son Yang Wenqian	Guangdong 1725-27
Grandson Yang Yingju	Shandong 1753-54
	Gansu 1759-60

49 Xuyuanmeng's son, and Shuchang's father, was Shuhede, a powerful courtier in the early Qianlong period.

Zhang Boxing	Fujian 1704-09
	Jiangsu 1709-15
Son Zhang Shizai	Anhui 1751-
Zhao Hongxie	Henan 1704-05
	Zhili 1705-22
Brother Zhao Hongen	Hubei 1729-30
	Hunan 1729-33
	Governor-general 1737
Nephew Zhao Zhihuan	Zhili 1722-23
Yue Jun (Son of Yue Zhongqi)	Shandong 1728-30
	Jiangxi 1736-40
	Guangdong 1747-49
	Yunnan 1749-1750
Fulaihun (Son of Fuheng)	
Liu Yong (Son of Liu Tongxun)	Hunan 1780-82

Alphonsus Vagnoni and His *Western Learning on Personal Cultivation*: The First Introduction of St. Thomas' Ethical Ideas in Chinese

Thomas H. C. Lee

Director of Asian Studies Program and Professor of History, City College, CUNY

Among the first Jesuit missionaries to come to China in the seventeenth century, Alphonsus Vagnoni (d. 1640) is best known for his writings in Chinese that introduced Western ethical and education ideas to China.[1] Vagnoni arrived in China in 1599. After moving around in Kuang-tung and Chiang-hsi, he finally settled in Nanking in 1611 and appeared to have been

1 I have written a Chinese article on Vagnoni's *Children's Education* (*T'ung-yu chiao-yü*), "Kao I-chih han t'a-te *T'ung-yu chiao-yü*," in Cheng T'ing-sheng, ed., *Chung-wai kuan-hsi shih kuo-chi hsüeh-shu yen-t'ao hui lun-wen chi -- ssu-hsiang yü wen-wu chiao-liu --* (Tan-shui: Department of History, Tamkang University, 1989), pp. 83-108.

quite successful in his missionary works. But his success only led to suspicion among the local officials. In 1616 Vagnoni was arrested, and his arrest marked the first official prosecution of Christianity in the history of the religion in modern China. Vagnoni's case was placed in the hands of a local official named Shen Ch'ueh沈㴶, who later expelled Vagnoni to Macao in 1617. Seven years later, however, Vagnoni managed to re-enter China and went to Shan-hsi, where he lived out the rest of his life until his death in 1640.

While in Nanking, Vagnoni used Wang Feng-su王豐肅 as his Chinese name. But in order to reenter China after his expulsion in 1617, he had to adopt a new name: Kao I-chih高一志. Kao I-chih is the more famous of the two or three Chinese names that Vagnoni used; it is also the name under which most of his Chinese works were published.

Vagnoni is known to have written and published at least seventeen works in Chinese.[2] Four of them use "hsi-hsueh"西學 (Western learning or Western scholarship) in their titles and are centered around the important subjects in Chinese ethical and political thinking. The four works are *Hsiu-shen hsi-hsueh* 修身西學 (*Western Learning on Personal Cultivation*, abbreviated as *Personal Cultivation* hereafter), *Ch'i-chia* 齊家 *hsi-hsüeh* (*Western Learning on the Management of a Household/Family*), *Hsi-hsüeh chih-p'ing*治平 (*Western Learning on the Management of the Nation and the World*), and *Min-chih*民治 *hsi-hsüeh* (*Western Learning on the Management*

2 Fang Hao's *Chung-kuo t'ien-chu chiao shih jen-wu chuan* (Hong Kong: Hsiang-kang kung-chiao chen-li hsüeh-hui, 1970), pp. 152-155, lists 15 of Kao's works. Fang Hao's book is by far the most complete biography of Kao in Chinese. Hartmut Walravens in his *Preliminary Checklist of Christian and Western Materials in Chinese in Three Major Collections* (Hamburg: C. Bell Verlag, 1982) lists seventeen of Kao's works.

of the Subjects).[3] These titles, with the exception of the last one, were obviously inspired by the famous "Eight Steps" of the canonical *Great Learning* (*Ta-hsüeh*大學). Furthermore, they reflect Vagnoni's attempt to introduce Western ethical ideas within a framework that was readily comprehensible to the Chinese mind.

Western Learning on the Management of a Family is a short essay, written in a simple, direct language, that discusses matters such as the selection of a spouse, wedding, and the married life. *Western Learning on the Management of the Nation and the World* discusses matters related to the foundation of sovereignty, the different types of government, and the exercise of sovereign authority. *Western Learning on the Management of the Subjects* is believed to be another treatise on the governing of people. In all, these writings point to Vagnoni's interest in explaining Western notions of morality and of the exercise of governmental power to the Chinese people. Moreover, the same interest can also be found in his other writings. *T'ung-yu chiao-yü* (*Children's Education*), which is sometimes appended as the second half of the *Ch'i-chia hsi-hsueh*, concentrates on the education of children and covers subjects such as friendship, penmanship, games, and clothes. It is written in plain Chinese and uses stories and parables to illustrate its key points. "Ten Comforts" (*Shih-wei*十慰), also by Vagnoni, deals with how to cope with losses, such as the loss of one's child, husband, position, property, or friendship, and with the idea and practice of penance.

Vagnoni's *Personal Cultivation* is another work that deals with ethical matters. The book is comprised of ten chapters, and was first issued in

3 For publication information about these works, see my Chinese article cited in note 1.

Chiang-chou絳州 (present day Jiangxian) of Shan-hsi in 1630.[4] It is a lengthy and substantial treatise on personal moral cultivation and includes some detailed discussions on the philosophical foundation of what is morally good and evil, and on the achievement of perfect goodness that is the way to true blessing. In what follows, I will discuss Vagnoni's *Personal Cultivation* by investigating its nature, content, and how Vagnoni employed many Chinese terms to demonstrate and depict ideas that the Chinese might have considered outlandish.

Summa Theologica in Nutshell

A quick reading of Vagnoni's *Personal Cultivation* will show that it is a fairly orthodox summary of Thomist philosophy, especially in the area of Christian ethics. Vagnoni might have relied on an existing treatise on the subject. What is important here is that the book is clearly a systematic introduction to Jesuit thinking on ethical matters.

The book has ten chapters. The first chapter is a preface that deals with man's will, its striving towards goodness, the categories of goodness, and how man's will is different from that of animals.[5] The second chapter is a

---

4 See note 3 above. The version I used in writing this article is the version published in Shanghai in 1923. I wish to thank the Theological Seminary of Fu-jen University (Taipei)for making its copy available to me. Incidentally, the first edition of the book (1630)was divided into five chapters.

5 This chapter covers the materials that are found, roughly, in the *Summa Theologica*, I-II, Q. 8-Q12. But see also II-II, Q. 73, art. 3 and I-II, Q. 84, art. 4. The *Summa Theologica* I used for writing this article is the one translated by Anton C. Pegis, *Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas* (New York: Random House, 1945), 2 vols. I also used Joseph Rickaby, *Aquinas Ethicus, The Moral Teaching of St. Thomas* (London: Burns & Waters, 1896), 2 vols., which is a translation of the ethical writings in the second part of the *Summa*.

discussion on the primary goal of man's will, which is beatitude or goodness, and on the threefold types (nature) of goodness, which are virtue, usefulness, and pleasure.[6]

The third chapter discusses how the body and soul are related, how the intellect, the senses, and the appetite work together, and how they are defined. It also discusses true love (will), which is moved by intellect or rational appetite, in contrast to false love (also will), which is moved by sense or sensitive appetites.[7]

The fourth chapter deals with the sensitive appetite and the passions associated with it: love, delight, concupiscence, hatred, irritability, sorrow, pain, hope, fear, daring, and anger.[8]

The fifth chapter is a discussion on the nature of movement, the cause of movement, and the bodily movement.[9]

With the sixth chapter, Vagnoni begins an exposition on virtues: their nature, cause, and meaning, the acquisition of virtues, the categories of virtues, and the four cardinal virtues (*tsung-te*宗德): prudence, temperance, justice, and fortitude (or bravery).[10]

Prudence is treated in the seventh chapter in great detail.[11] Temperance

---

6 This chapter covers the materials that are found, roughly, in *Summa*, Part I, esp., Q. 44; art. 3 and Q. 45, art. 2; I-II, Q. 4; and Q. 69, art.3.

7 This chapter is based by and large on the *Summa*, I-II, Q. 12-21.

8 This chapter is based largely on the *Summa*, I-II, Q. 24-50.

9 *Summa*, I-II, Q. 18-19; II-II, Q. 73.

10 *Summa*, I-II, Q. 55-66.

11 *Summa*, I-II, Q. 57, art. 4-6; II-II, Q. 47; 48, art. 1; Q. 50, art 4; Q. 55, art. 1; *passim*. St. Thomas' discussion on prudence is found in various parts of the *Summa*. Vagnoni took great care to gather them together, so that he could give a full account of this important "intellectual virtue," which he translates as "ming-chih chih te." (7/48)

is treated in the eighth chapter.[12] Also discussed in detail are other virtues related to temperance, such as continence, meekness and clemency, modesty, etc. Fortitude, as well as the virtues associated with it, such as magnanimity, magnificence, patience and perseverance, is discussed in the ninth chapter.[13] Justice is the subject of the last chapter, which is itself subdivided into fifteen sections.[14]

Vagnoni's book is clearly a selected introduction to the ethical ideas that could be found in the then prevalent Jesuit thinking, reflecting the fundamental ideas first spelled out by St. Thomas. The book is not a direct translation of St. Thomas's *Summa Theologica*; rather, it is a summary of the key points found therein. That this book is above all concerned with ethical issues is evidenced by the fact that Vagnoni takes great pain to elaborate on leading moral conceptions (virtues, *te*德). The treatments of these cardinal virtues are much more detailed than, though consistent with, St. Thomas' discussions on them.

A careful examination of the precise allusions to St. Thomas' *Summa Theologica* in Vagnoni's *Western Learning in Personal Cultivation* is not a main concern of this paper. A preliminary check shows that Vagnoni might have had used another Jesuit work as his source, since certain ideas which he explores in lengthy details are merely glossed over in the *Summa*. For example, the discussion on the distinctions between cause, form, matter, and end (goal), a discussion that is not specially treated in the *Summa*, is mentioned as a crucial issue in Vagnoni's second chapter, thus revealing Vagnoni's Aristotelian perspective. Similarly, Vagnoni groups the concupiscible and iracible passions together with the other nine passions, forming eleven passions, a scheme that

12 *Summa*, II-II, Q. 141, art. 4; Q. 143.
13 *Summa*, II-II, Q. 123 and 128.
14 *Summa*, I-II, Q. 65, art. 2; II-II, Q. 57-18; Q. 80, art. 1.

differs from St. Thomas' placing five under concupiscible passions and four under irascible passions. However, it is generally clear that St. Thomas' discussions on man (especially Questions 75 to 89 of part I, and Questions 1 to 48 of part I-II of the *Summa*), habits (especially I-II, Q. 59 to 61), prudence and justice (II-II, Q. 47 to 122), and fortitude and temperance (II-II, Q. 123-170), are the basis of Vagnoni's own treatments of the same subjects in his book.

In order to allow the Chinese readers to better grasp the complicated and often involved arguments in his work, Vagnoni provides, though sparingly, examples that illustrate his arguments. The technique of citing examples is rarely found in St. Thomas' very compact and concise treatise. But despite the use of numerous examples in it, Vagnoni's *Personal Cultivation* remains a very difficult book, in sharp contrast to Vagnoni's other writings that are typically written in a very plain and accessible Chinese. This work is evidently unique among Vagnoni's writings. As such, it is truly a serious attempt at introducing one of the most difficult books in the Western intellectual tradition to China.

Moral Prerogative vs. Theological Concern

Although Vagnoni had published works that deal directly with Christian rituals and ceremonies, he seemed to have avoided entering into ontological or theological discussions on issues such as the nature and the existence of God, and the concept of trinity. Vagnoni's focus on ethical issues reflects his awareness of the Chinese lack of interests in Western theological debates.

Yet Vagnoni did introduce some ideas that are of theological interest. First of all, he begins the book with a brief introductory note stating that philosophy, which he transliterated as *fei-lo-so-fei-ya* 費羅所非亞, consists

mainly of two branches: the study of *hsing* 性 (human nature) and *li*^{a} 理 (principle), and the study of *i* 義 (righteousness or rightness; also justice) and *li*^{b} 禮 (rites or decorum). By *hsing-li*^{a}, Vagnoni is clearly referring to metaphysics, and *i-li*^{b}, ethics.According to him, among the different concerns of *i-li*^{b}, personal moral cultivation (*hsiu-shen*) is what he intends to discuss in this particular work (1/1).

Vagnoni's way of distinguishing the different branches of philosophy is interesting. However, the distinction does not quite serve his purpose, since he seems to be using *i- li*^{b} and *i- li*^{a} interchangeably in the book. This is more so because *i- li*^{b}, as a term for scholarship, is quite foreign to Chinese readers, who would easily assume that, for Vagnoni, *li*^{a} and *li*^{b} mean precisely the same thing. Further, the Chinese might have thought that the West conceives of that principle as inherent in rituals, and that in the West, as well as in China, *hsing- li*^{a} and *i- li*^{b} refer to the same thing: moral learning.

The difference in Vagnoni's and the Chinese conception of *li* is problematic. Vagnoni does try to make a distinction between *li*^{a}, as principle, and *li*^{b}, as rite or decorum. He must have felt that the study that could be properly termed *li*^{a} is metaphysical or theological in nature, and that it is difficult to explain to Chinese readers. Therefore, he chooses to concentrate on practice and behavior. Obviously, practical moral issues are his main concern here, aside from his remarks on complicated issues related to philosophy, *hsing- li*^{a}, and *i- li*^{b}.

Vagnoni clearly tries to avoid theological arguments. And he does so consistently. For instance, in discussing the various virtues, St. Thomas often considers whether or not a particular virtue, say, fearlessness, is a sin. Such discussions, however, are left out entirely in Vagnoni's treatise in Chinese (see 9/71). Vagnoni, for his part, has consistently avoided entering a

discussion on the theologically significant notion of sin.[15]

The interest in ethical considerations also dictates Vagnoni in places where he deliberately chooses Chinese expressions that are fundamentally ethical in their meaning. This is evident in his choosing words such as *jen*, *t'i* and *hsiao* 仁悌孝 (10/90-92) to translate piety, observance, and obedience.[16] Vagnoni is clearly aware that the three Chinese terms are all philosophically loaded expressions. For St. Thomas, however, the virtues of piety, observance, and obedience, considered the constituent virtues of the general virtue of justice, are ideas related to political justice or good government. In *Summa*, these ideas are discussed in the context of clarifying the relationship between the individual and his superiors such as God, parents, political leaders, or teachers (professor). Piety is the first of the three and, according to St. Thomas, the basis of observance and obedience. Though he was aware of St. Thomas's ideas, Vagnoni decided to use the expressions that have been very important to China's long intellectual tradition, expressions such as *jen*, *t'i*, and *hsiao*. Clearly, the choice of *jen*, as the word for piety, is a very bold one, as *jen* is the most widely used term that carries a broad range of meanings in Chinese ethical thinking. *T'i*, which generally denotes the love between siblings, also stands in contrast to *hsiao* which, roughly speaking, denotes piety towards one's parents. All three are ethical ideas and carry very little political or hierarchical connotations.

---

15 In 9/74, where Vagnoni discusses "vain glory," which in Thomist philosophy is also a sin, but Vagnoni avoids again mentioning the word "sin." In reading through the work, one senses that Vagnoni perhaps used *o* to translate sin. See 4/22: "Thus, sin (*o* 惡) is not real; it is only the lack of goodness." Compare this with the *Summa*, I-II, Q. 18, art. 5: "Since evil is a privation, it is a non-being." I guess that it was not until Protestant missionaries that sin became consistently translated into *chui* 罪. See also note 30 below.

16 These three words are now commonly translated into humanity (*jen*), brotherly (and sisterly) love (*t'i*) and filial piety (*hsiao*).

Vagnoni, however, cautions his readers that his *hsiao* is defined in a broader sense, and that the much more narrowly conceived Chinese *hsiao* is only a part of the virtue of piety, that is, *jen*: "Chinese learning considers *hsiao* as a virtue that is exclusively [defined in relation] to one's parents. In the Western learning, *hsiao* is used broadly. The filial piety that the children direct to their parents is included in the virtue of piety."(10/92)

It is interesting and significant, to say the least, that *jen* is defined by St. Thomas as only a part of the virtue of justice. For all its discussions on personal moral cultivation, St. Thomas argues that ultimately the underlying virtue that makes moral perfection possible is in the respect of justice. Thus, *jen*, an important Chinese concept, is here considered a mere subordinate to justice. This must have been difficult for the Chinese to understand, let alone appreciate.

Because any lengthy discussion of Christian ethics inevitably touches upon the fountain-head of all ethical precepts, the idea of God appears in *Personal Cultivation* from time to time.[17] Vagnoni, however, tries to infuse the discussion with the notion of *t'ien-li* 天理 (heavenly principle, 5/33) that serves as an additional basis of all ethical ideas. Therefore, Vagnoni contends that in order for one to tell good from evil, one must rely on the order of the Creator (*tsao-wu che* 造物者) and on *t'ien-li*. Theologically, the foundation for goodness is God, and God is incapable of evil. Moreover, evil is an inadequacy of goodness, according to St. Thomas.[18] Such theological considerations certainly did not sit well with the Neo-Confucian belief, then

---

17 Often translated into *tsao-wu chu* (the Lord that creates things; the Creator, see 4/23, 4/24), *tsao-wu ta-chu* 大主 (the Great Lord Creator, 2/8), *t'ien-chu* 天主 (Heavenly Lord, 2/12, 5/32), etc.

18 *Summa*, I, Q. 49, Anton C. Pegis, *Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas* (New York: Random House, 1945), vol. 1, pp. 476-477. See also, for a succinct exposition on evil, Gilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 155-159.

prevalent in China, that *t'ien-li* and *jen-yü* (human desire) are two opposing ideas or evenly-matched forces.[19] St. Thomas' monotheistic approach to the origin of good and evil had to be expressed in a quintessentially Chinese rhetoric of duality, at least in this particular case. This is another example of the attempt to make a theological discourse on moral ideas understandable to a readership that is more used to an absolute dichotomy between good and evil.

From the brief discussion above, one can see that Vagnoni, while aware of the moral thinking and teaching that were central to the Chinese preoccupation with good life and society, was finding it difficult to explain some of the rather complicated ideas found in the theological treatises of St. Thomas. Thus, Vagnoni decided to focus on moral issues.

The Question of Human Nature

The discussions on human nature are found all over Chinese philosophical works; and it is clear that Vagnoni must have learned from his Chinese scholar-friends Mencius' theory of the inherent goodness of human nature. The debates on human nature were further developed by Ch'eng Hao (1032-1085) and Ch'eng I (1033-1107) and by Chu Hsi (1130-1200) in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Couched within metaphysical and ontological arguments, the goodness of human nature was now understood in ontological terms. For them, human nature is in accord with the principle (*li*[a]), or even is the principle itself, and is therefore justifiably good. In this way, the notion that human nature is good can be manipulated so that it would correspond to

19 Here and there, the expression, "selfish desire" (*ssu-yü*私欲) is found in the work (see 4/23 for example): "Human nature and will (*hsing-ch'ing*性情) is clouded by selfish desire." I must add that St. Thomas' "will" is also translated as *ai*愛.

St. Thomas' viewpoint, even if orthodox Christianity teaches that human nature has fallen and is in a sinful state. Thomist theology, emerging at a time when the Augustinian view was at its nadir, is less adamant about making such a claim.[20] In other words, without the ontological principle, or God, evil or sin is nothing, even though evil arises not from God (or principle, as the Chinese would say) and relies not on Him for subsistence. Though such an argument may be linguistically complicated, it is not difficult to understand. Human nature, broadly defined, is good. As a Thomist would say, "evil really has no formal cause. Rather, it is reduced to a simple privation of form."[21] That is, the "formal cause" must be good.

On the other hand, it is also clear that Chu Hsi and many of his followers, while shying away from a transcendentalist position, did strongly hold that the material force (*ch'i* 氣), which explains the origin of evil, should not be understood as a simple but equally powerful derivation from the principle. For them, evil forces, or physical substances that deviate from the original principle and goodness, are secondary to the principle, are poorer in quality, and are not much more than reflections of selfish human desires. A dualistic premise seems to be at work there, though many thinkers after them have always cautioned against it (see later). Chu Hsi's position on this subject is not entirely clear, although my reading convinces me that he would definitely have not taken a dualist position.

Ming thinkers, defining the parameters of the discourse on this issue,

---

20 There is no entry for "sin" in the "Analytical Index" of Etienne Gilson's important *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (New York: Random House, 1956). Of course, St. Thomas does treat the issue of sin at lenght in *Summa*, I-II, especially Questions 71-89.

21 Gilson, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

generally agreed that a dualistic approach was unsatisfactory. Instead, the likes of Lo Ch'in-shun 羅欽順 (1465-1547) sought to understand the goodness of human nature as a spontaneity that follows the original and innate dictate of human's own nature, which is principle per se.[22] Such an approach is somewhat monistic in nature and would certainly have been easy for Vagnoni to understand.[23] In general, the metaphysics of Aristotle, Abelard and St. Thomas, is monotheistic or monistic at its basis, that is, there is only one ultimate source of creation, including that of human nature, and that all creatures in their different degrees of perfection derive their existence from this source. This understanding of human nature certainly would not have entertained a dualistic assumption that good and evil co-exist equally and have different origins. In this sense, some late Ming thinkers might have been able to speak to Vagnoni and to create some degree of resonance within him. Or they might not have found Vagnoni's arguments entirely unacceptable, even though the logic of his arguments could sound rather un-convincing. It is clear that the central concern of the Chinese thinkers at the time was ethical rather than metaphysical in nature. Moreover, the monistic premise was never systematically spelled out. It was certainly not as clearly spelled out as the underlying tone of Ch'eng-Chu orthodox belief, which tends to imply dualism.[24] For a casual reader at the time, the relationship

---

22 Irene Bloom, *Knowledge Painfully Acquired, the* K'un-chih chi *by Lo Ch'in-shun* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987), pp. 17-21.

23 For Lo Ch'in-shun's monism, see Irene Bloom, *op.cit.*, pp. 34-36 and *passim*.

24 It is useful here to point out that Chu Hsi was confronted in Fukien with some form of Manichaeanism, a religion that had embraced theological dualism. It is not known if the dualistic belief was still a distinct characteristic of the vegetarian practice of *shih-ts'ai shih-mo* 食菜事魔 (vegetarian and worshipping the "devil" or "Ma[nichaeanism]") that Chu Hsi found so abhorrent. Ch'en Chih-ch'ao 陳智超 has argued that the "mo" here is Manichaeanism.

between good and evil, as found in such complicated discussions, was not only irrelevant but quite incomprehensible. For him, the dualistic perspective would have been more natural and understandable. Consequently, Vagnoni avoided a truthful treatment on the origin of evil,[25] since any discussion on this issue would inevitably invite a systematic reflection on and examination of the monistic nature of the Christian theology of God and free will. This kind of predicament, however, does not exist in a dualistic approach to God. In short, dualistic or not, any discussion on the original human nature would always be a difficult exercise for anyone espousing the Thomist position.[26]

There is little doubt that Vagnoni was aware of Mencius' ideas. On the other hand, he also understood that what the Western thinkers considered to be nature, as well as the ideas of good and evil derived from it, is not exactly what the ethically-conscious Chinese meant in the dictum, *hsing chi li* 性即理([human] nature is principle). In one place, Vagnoni states that he would discuss elsewhere the fact that "human nature was initially good and only became astray later"(4/32). Though the statement is vague, Vagnoni does use *jen-hsing* (for human nature) in a unmistakable manner. In another place, he argues that what he means by *shan* 善 (goodness, see later) is the *shan* of virtue (*te* 德) and not of "[human] nature" (*hsing* 性)(4/34). Obviously, the necessarily subtle and apparently contradictory discussion on nature and on its goodness would invite only confusion and would require the invention of an entirely new set of vocabulary. Vagnoni

25 But see note 15 above.

26 Expressions like that "there are two kinds of happiness (or beatitude); one is from following soul and another from following corporeal body," (8/56) suggest some kind of dualistic approach. They may be inevitable oversimplification of St. Thomas' thought and are not written to appeal to Chinese readers.

could not afford to do so. In short, his fundamental concern in this book is with behavioral goodness and not with the metaphysical idea of "human nature being good." As a result, there are a lot of ambiguities, if not outright contradictions, in Vagnoni's work.

Yet in various places in the book, Vagnoni does enter into some detailed discussions on the nominalist idea of nature and points out that evil is the inadequacy, or failure, at perfecting nature, human nature included. This approach is central to Christian ethics. But one must wonder if the idea is comprehensible to the Chinese mind and if it can be expressed in the Chinese language. As pointed out above, while Neo-Confucian consensus during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries toward the idea of evil was approximating a monistic position, the position held by the larger population, which did not bother with such a sophistry, was more dualistic. This is evident in the Chinese vocabulary, with its many nuances, that related to expressions of moral ideas.[27]

First of all, *yü*, which could be properly translated as "human desire" (that is, understood as *jen-yü* 人慾), is not only an inadequate manifestation of human nature, which is originally and fundamentally good, but is generally considered by Chinese thinkers to be contrary to the principle (*li*[a]) and an approximate equal to evil. *Yü*, however, is used by Vagnoni as a kind of passion, which is neutral in the ethical sense. He uses *yü* to translate "concupiscible passions," which include love, hatred, desire (or concupiscence), aversion (or dislike), delight (or joy), and sorrow (sadness). For Vagnoni, as well as St. Thomas, *yü* is a kind of passion that moves humans towards goodness or

27 Perhaps the Ch'eng-Chu reaction towards the end of the Ming, against Ming Neo-Confucianism could be understood in light of this tendency for monistic approach to the issues surrounding the origins or causes of evil.

beatitude. Vagnoni states it clearly in *Personal Cultivation*: "*Yü* (desire) is the mind (or sensitive appetite) that moves toward beatitude (goodness)." (4/22) This is in accord with what St. Thomas has carefully expounded in the *Summa* (see I-II, Q. 24-3) concerning the definition of "passion." Passions as such are therefore neutral and will not work for evil if controlled by reason. However, for the Chinese, the claim that *yü* could help a person in his pursuit for goodness was a strange one.

This is even more evident in Vagnoni's contention that fear, daring, and anger (which he translated into *chü-ch'ing*懼情, *kuo-kan*果敢, and *fen-nu*忿怒) are also passions needed to balance the other passions in the achievement of good judgement. In the Chinese usage, words like *chü* and *fen-nu* are considered as intrinsically bad; they could not be of any assistance to the achievement of good judgement, especially on ethical matters. Vagnoni's exposition on how these passions could be understood in a neutral sense is an excellent example of the intellectual ambiguity in interpreting two value systems. For example, in order to avoid the readers' confusion between the anger that is a passion capable of moving towards goodness and the anger that most Chinese would understand as, by definition, bad or evil, Vagnoni uses two Chinese words to translate it:[28] one originates from sheer desire (*yü*) and another from soul (*shen*神, which in Vagnoni's use could also mean reason). Now, such a distinction is not found in St. Thomas' original formulation, at least in the part where he discusses

---

28 St. Thomas' treatment of anger is in *Summa*, Q. 46-47. Vagnoni does point out that "even though anger is worse than hatred, it is in its original intention a desire."(4/28) Compare this with St. Thomas' statements: "anger does not arise except on account of some grief inflicted; and unless there be desire and hope of revenge," (*Summa*, I-II, Q. 46, 1) and "hatred is much worse and more grievous than anger."(*Ibid.*, 2)

anger.[29] What is even more confusing is that Vagnoni decides also to use the word, *yü*, that he has already given a new and Western definition.

Explaining the difference between the two kinds of anger, Vagnoni takes an active step in saying that one kind of anger is moved by reason or soul, and the other, *yü* (desire). For St. Thomas, an undesired consequence of anger is its hindering the exercise of reason (I-II, Q. 48, art. 3). St. Thomas' approach is passive and does not fall into the dualistic trap of speculating how the inappropriate exercise of anger could arise. Yet for Vagnoni and his collaborators, such a speculation seems necessary in order to avoid the awkward position of having to include anger as a passion that could also be useful in the search for goodness. Here, the introduction of the notion that anger belongs to *yü* is clearly Chinese in nature and ironically, under the circumstances, has to be expressed only in Chinese.

The Problem of Evil, Human nature and *Ch'i*

Of all the philosophical exercises, the problem of evil is among the most difficult in Chinese thinking, as it is also for Western thinking. Within the problem, the question of how humans acquired evil has always been examined in the context of understanding whether humans are evil by nature.

29 It is true that St. Thomas does make a distinction between human sensuality (sensitive appetite) and that of animal, in that human is capable of obeying reason and therefore. participates in liberty. However, St. Thomas goes deeper into this distinction by pointing out that passion cannot by definition be bad. It is only in the passion of anger that there is no "contrariety." This makes anger different from other passions, one that by definition is outside of reason's rule. It is thus interesting to note that Vagnoni should discuss the neutrality of passion in the part of anger. However, St. Thomas' postulation here seems to me to have not been the source of Vagnoni's distinction. For "contrariety," see *Summa*, I-II, Q. 23, art. 4. See also Gilson, *op. cit.*, 271-286.

For St. Thomas, who had succeeded the Christian Fathers, and whose idea on this issue has since then been shared by many later theologians, even Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955),[30] the problem of sin and evil is defined in the context of human's relationship to God that is transcendental, and evil that is not capable of existence on its own. Even in modern theology, in which transcendence is less a preoccupation, the issue of evil is still understood in terms of how humans could have acquired the "evil nature" in accord with their necessary imperfection. At the very least, it remains a central problem in Christian theology. In this sense, human responsibility is intimately relevant to the discourse, and sin, which is an outcome of human's own free choice, always leads to ultimate condemnation. Humans with their freedom are therefore responsible for their own destiny.[31] In the Christian exercise, thus, evil is couched in the discourse of responsibility and of the inadequacy of the created when compared to the perfect creator, God.

Such a position would not be entirely impossible to understand for Chu Hsi, as mentioned above. However, by the late Ming times, the idea that evil is a kind of imperfection had already been so much debated that one would think that the Chinese should be able to understand, let alone accept, a Thomist position. This shall be made clear when we discuss the Ming discussions on material force (*ch'i* 氣) and physical nature (*ch'i-chih chih hsing* 氣質之性).

---

30 Teilhard's *Le Phenomene Humain* is criticized for not entering any discussion on the problem of evil or for that matter sin. In his Appendix, in answering to the criticism, he gives an account of his thought about the issue. A reading of this short essay shows that his position is fundamentally Thomist. See the English translation, *The Phenomenon of Man* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), pp. 339-342.

31 This is a thesis that is very difficult to accept. Therefore there is on the one hand theological fatalism, as represented by John Calvin, and on the other hand the optimism as represented by Leibniz. This is not a place to discuss the issue.

The Chinese discourse on human nature (*hsing*), during Vagnoni's time, was related to the problem of *ch'i*. It is significant that Vagnoni uses *ch'i* freely in this and his other works. His uses of it deserve an examination that will help us to better understand the issue of evil, as defined by St. Thomas, and which Vagnoni had much difficulty conveying. First of all, although *ch'i* had been considered as an equal to the principle (*li*[a]) by Chang Tsai 張載 (1020-1077), who was the first to systematically articulate this conception, later philosophers, beginning with Chu Hsi, had relegated it to a secondary position, equating it with the various material manifestations of the principle. Although a thorough discussion on this subject is not called for here, it is important to note that in the sixteenth century, not long before the arrival of Vagnoni in Shan-hsi, a prominent Neo-Confucian philosopher from the neighboring region of Shen-hsi, Hsüeh Hsüan 薛瑄 (1389-1464), was working on the revival of Chang's position.[32] In direct opposition to Chu Hsi, Hsüeh argued that "the principle is (exists) only within material force. There is no difference in which one is first."[33] Hsüeh's attempt was aimed at the restoration of the idea of *ch'i* as an equal to *li*[a]. It is conceivable that Vagnoni's understanding of *ch'i* was influenced by Hsüeh, especially since Vagnoni completed almost all of his ethical writings in the province next to Hsüeh's home town, a place known for its Chang Tsai scholarly tradition. In any case,

32 There is no English work on Hsüeh Hsüan. A good Chinese introduction to his thought is Hou Wai-lu et al., *Sung Ming li-hsüeh shih* (Beijing: Jen-min, 1987), vol. 2, pp. 119-135. This book carefully explains Hsüeh's discussions against Chu Hsi's position that "*li*[a]" is prior to "*ch'i*". Hsüeh's collected work, *Hsüeh Wen-ch'ing kung ch'üan-chi* in 46 chapters, is unfortunately not available to me. For selections of his intellectual writings, see Huang Tsung-hsi, ed., *Ming-ju hsüeh-an* (Beijing: Chung-hua, 1985), vol. 2, chapter 7, pp. 109-124 (abbreviated as 7: 109-124).

33 Quoted in Huang Tsung-hsi, *Ming-ju hsüeh-an*, 7: 118.

by the time Vagnoni was writing his educational works, Neo-Confucian thinking was stressing the unity between principle and material force.

In the *Personal Cultivation*, there are at least two places where *ch'i* is related to *chih* 志, which Vagnoni uses to translate "will."[34] Vagnoni states that "*ch'i* is found wherever *chih* is found"(3/16) and that "human *chih* is derived from *ch'i* and where *ch'i* is strong, *chih* will also be strong"(4/28). These statements closely echo Hsüeh's teachings on *chih*, which should be translated as "purpose" in English. Hsüeh states: "If the *chih* moves the *ch'i*, then one will act according to the principle; if the *ch'i* moves the *chih*, then one will act according to selfish desire (*yü*)."[35] The intricate relationship between *ch'i* and *chih* is employed by Vagnoni to help explain an equally intricate relationship between intention and *ch'i*, as found in St. Thomas' thinking.

But before I discuss what is the Western term for which *ch'i* was used as a translation by Vagnoni, let me complete the examination on the relationship between *ch'i* and human nature. It is a relationship that could be made clear only if we could see how *ch'i* is, in turn, related to *chih* (purpose or intention) in Hsüeh Hsüan's thought. Hsüeh argued that *hsing* (human nature) is central to the understanding of *ch'i*, which is itself considered an equal to the principle (*li*[a]).[36] This being the case, purpose (*chih*) is conceivably that force which is capable of leading or commanding humans to act according

---

34 Vagnoni apparently also uses *ai* to translated will. See note 19 above.

35 Huang Tsung-hsi, *Sung Yuan Hsüeh-an*, 7: 116. It must be pointed out that *chih* (purpose) is not an important conception in Hsüeh's thought. This is the only place where he mentions this word.

36 See the long passage on the relationship between human nature (*hsing*)and material force (*ch'i*) in *ibid*., 7: 124. Briefly speaking, Hsüeh thinks that although material force and human nature are not the same things, they rely on each other, and should be considered as separate entities/concepts. "There is no *hsing* without *ch'i*; there is not *ch'i* without *hsing*," says Hsüeh.

to the principle.[37] It is true that Hsüeh wrote very little on the idea of "purpose." But his occasional comments on it show that he had gone beyond what earlier thinkers, such as Ch'en Ch'un陳淳(1159-1223), had provided.[38] For Hsüeh, human nature is often understood in the ethical sense, since an individual's actions are manifestations of his/her nature. It is purpose that could bring the principle to harness the tendency towards selfishness or to bring about the principle with which the human *ch'i* should seek to reconcile.

Hsüeh's conception of human nature, while bound to his theory of *ch'i*, is also ethically oriented. Further, it is clearly built upon the assumption that human nature is inherently good. It is here that Vagnoni's position ceases to approximate that of Hsüeh's. For Vagnoni, *ch'i* could be conceived only in a neutral way. This certainly is not Hsüeh's position.

Thus, the discussions above shows that the problem of the origin of evil, with which both Chinese and Western thinkers have grappled, is related to ideas of human nature and to the peculiar Chinese notion of *ch'i*. All are mutually intertwined and are related, again according to the Chinese thinkers, to the problem whether *ch'i* is equal to human nature. Clearly, the Chinese approaches are ambiguous. Further confusion is added when Vagnoni borrowed the concept of *ch'i* to express the Thomist theory on the problem of evil. What precisely does Vagnoni mean by *ch'i* ?

It suffices to say that Vagnoni's employment of many Chinese expressions of moral ideas partakes a certain danger. While sophisticated

---

37 While agreeing with Ch'eng I that human nature is principle, Hsüeh actually often conceives human nature in dynamic terms, and argues that *hsing* is what overcomes the *ch'i* to complete principle: "one who has difficulty in overcoming himself is one who does not let his will/purpose suppress *ch'i*." *Ibid.*, 7: 117.

38 Wing-tsit Chan, *Neo-Confucian Terms Explained* (*The* Pei-hsi tzu-i) *by Ch'en Ch'un, 1159-1123* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), pp. 64-67.

thinkers in the Ming times might have been able to articulate ethical ideas of good and evil from a somewhat monistic approach, most of the Chinese expressions were constructed on a dualistic basis, so much so that Vagnoni's claims must have appeared quite strange, even incomprehensible, to the casual Chinese reader. Similarly, while some Ming thinkers were able to accept a neutralist position with regards to human nature, a position essential to a correct understanding of the Thomist position about nature in general, Vagnoni was impelled by the equally involved Chinese discourse on this issue to modify some of the original Western ideas so that what St. Thomas had perhaps only hinted at could now be fully expounded by him for the Chinese readers. Vagnoni's use of the rather developed concept of *ch'i* is a case in point.

Material Force (*ch'i*), Material Force of Blood (*hsüeh-ch'i*血氣) and Blood

Ch'i, as a complicated Chinese philosophical concept, has been briefly touched upon in the previous section. It is useful here to remind the readers that *ch'i*, within the Neo-Confucian framework of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was widely conceived of as a mere derivative of principle. In addition, it was considered equal to the vital force, understood in the materialist way, that sustains the life of various things in the universe. These things are the material manifestations of their principle. The part of human nature which reflects this inadequate rendering of the principle is called physical nature (*ch'i-chih chih hsing*氣質之性which literally means the [human] nature that belongs to *ch'i*.) Obviously, the idea of physical nature serves to explain the source of evil that pollutes or contaminates the

original purity and goodness of human nature.[39]

The physical aspect of the idea of *ch'i*, even if conceived ethically, is closely related to the Chinese expression *hsüeh-ch'i* (literally, the material force of blood) which, since Confucius first used it in the *Analects*, has almost always meant physical strength:

> Master K'ung said, "There are three things against which a gentleman is on his guard. In his youth, before his blood and vital humours have settled down, he is on his guard against lust. Having reached his prime, when the blood and vital humours have finally hardened, he is on his guard against strife. Having reached old age, when the blood and vital humours are already decaying, he is on his guard against avarice."[40]

Ch'i, which the English translator, Arthur Waley, interprets as a kind of vital humor, has been traditionally accepted as meaning physical strength. Now, it is important to note that Vagnoni has generously used the idea of *hsüeh-ch'i* in his various writings.[41] An examination of his usage shows that, for

---

39 For a short but useful discussion on Chu Hsi's *ch'i-chih chih-hsing*, see Ch'en Jung-chieh (Wing-tsit Chan), *Sung Ming li-hsüeh chih kai-nien yü li-shih* (Taipei: Chung-yang yen-chiu yuan Chung-kuo wen-che yen-chiu so, 1996), pp. 49-52. See Also Wei Cheng-t'ung, *Chung-kuo che-hsüeh tz'u-tien* (Taipei), pp. 534-541.

40 *Analects*, xvi, 7. Here I am using Arthur Waley's translation. It is useful to note that Waley considers *hsüeh-ch'i* as blood and humor. In early modern Western physiological theories, blood indeed was related to humor. Simon Leys, in his translation, uses simply "energy of the blood" to translate *hsüeh-ch'i*. *Hsüeh-ch'i* is found also used in *Records of Rites* (*Li-chi*) and *Kuan-tzu*, invariably to mean physical strength, including that of animals.

41 For example, his *T'ung-yu chiao-yü* disusses the relationship between the two. See my article cited in note 1. It would seem that this discussion is based on St. Thomas' sensitive appetite and intellectual appetite, in, e. g., *Summa*, I-II, Q.31, art. 4 or Q. 59, art. 4.

him, *hsüeh-ch'i* is not only physical strength, but is, at the same time, a force capable of directing an individual toward goodness (3/14 & 4/20, for examples; here *hsüeh-ch'i* is used as sensitive appetite). Vagnoni makes a distinction between pure and inpure (contaminated) *hsüeh-ch'i* and argues that a young person whose *hsüeh-ch'i* (that is, physical strength) is strong enough is more capable of obtaining a purity of his will in the pursuit of goodness, while those who are weak in *hsüeh-ch'i* are usually unable to obtain the purity and single-mindedness needed in seeking moral perfection. It is important to note how Vagnoni uses the simple Chinese expression of *hsüeh-ch'i* to explain what is clearly a Western concept: "blood," which gives vitality to life, or which is life itself. The interesting thing is that blood is not actually used by St. Thomas in his discussions on the human corporeal body, and therefore is not a part of the Thomist discourse on physical strength or sensitive appetite. However, medieval European science widely held that blood has a lot to do with humor and is that from which sensitive appetite arises. Therefore, it is not strange at all that Vagnoni gladly uses *hsüeh-ch'i* in translating bodily strength or sensitive appetite.

There is a difficulty here, however, concerning whether *hsüeh-ch'i* could be simultaneously used for both sensitive appetite and physical strength. Vagnoni, in *Western Learning on Personal Cultivation*, is using *hsüeh-ch'i* to translate, though only approximately, the sensitive or sensuous appetite (see 3/14, 16, 17, *passim*). It is difficult to see how this usage could be reconciled with his other usage of the term as physical strength. However, since the moral implication of sensitive appetite (which in Thomist formulation does not necessarily mean belonging to or inclining toward the evil) is particularly evident in Vagnoni's Chinese text, one gets the impression that

the will which belongs to *hsüeh-ch'i* is necessarily evil. The result is the unintentioned conclusion that *hsüeh-ch'i* is fundamentally immoral. This cannot be Vagnoni's original intention.

Interestingly, the distinction between pure and inpure *hsüeh-ch'i*, which appears in his other works, does not appear in the *Personal Cultivation*.[42] Still, for Vagnoni, *hsüeh-ch'i* as a type of sensitive appetite is about human physical strength; any Chinese reader, however casual, would immediately associate it with the ambiguous but important formulation, a formulation important among Ming Neo-Confucian thinkers, of the *ch'i-chih chih-hsing* (physical nature) vs. *i-li*[a] *chih-hsing*義理之性.

For the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Chinese thinkers, nature that is manifest in *ch'i* is sometimes pure (*ching*精) and sometimes impure (or coarse, *ch'u*粗).[43] The idea is that the pure physical nature is that which reflects the original goodness in human nature, whereas the impure physical nature is that which is contaminated and therefore would lead man toward evil. The Chinese usage of purity and impurity, in the context of human nature, is fundamentally different from the Thomist formulation of sensitive appetite. For the Chinese, the movement toward good or evil is central to purity or impurity of human actions. In other words, while the Thomist formulation allows human action to be either pure or impure, the Chinese formulation does not allow the co-existence of both good and evil actions. For Ming thinkers, evil is dependent on external

42 This distinction is found in his *Children's Education*. See my article cited in note 1.

43 This is most evident in Liu Chung-chou's thought. See Hou Wai-lu *et al.*, *Sung Ming li-hsüeh shih*, vol. 2, pp. 619-624, however, the formulation went back to Ch'eng I and Chu Hsi. Liu Tsung-chou was critical of the distinction.

influences and is not essential or fundamental to human nature.[44] Still, one is tempted to think that in the deployment of such ideas of purity and impurity, both the Chinese thinkers and the Thomist theologians were working in very similar veins.

In his essay, Vagnoni does not introduce the metaphysical distinction between pure and impure physical strengths, which would have been too convoluted for the common readers. Such an introduction, therefore, is not called for in his brief essay. Perhaps Vagnoni's Chinese collaborators could not fully comprehend the intended meaning of sensitive appetite as a force capable of moving man toward both good and evil. The borrowing of Chinese philosophical terms appears to have provided an easy solution to Vagnoni's problem of presentation. But in so doing, Vagnoni interestingly attaches an ethical emphasis to the consideration of human physical strength. The purer one's *hsüeh-ch'i* is, the more capable one becomes, and the more inclined one is toward moral commitment and toward a single-mindedness in determination; the less pure, or the more impure, one's *hsüeh-ch'i* is, the more inclined one is toward evil.

Although Vagnoni does not explicitly make such an assertion (as he does in *Children's Education*), the implication is very clear here. To the idea of physical strength is added a new dimension by Vagnoni; physical strength also means spiritual or ethical strength, depending on the state of purity of one's physical nature, now expressed as *hsüeh-ch'i*. Vagnoni's peculiar interpretation of *hsüeh-ch'i* as both physical strength and ethical ability (sensitive appetite), while basically Christian, reflects the contemporary

44 Of course, St. Thomas is here talking only about human action, while Chinese Neo-Confucianists do not take on such a subtle distinction between nature and action.

Chinese understanding of physical nature.

One may wish to pause here and reflect on how *hsüeh-ch'i* was connected to "blood" which, as a physiological concept, has occupied a significant place in the history of Western science. There is no doubt that Vagnoni was knowledgeable about the pre-Harvey scholarship on blood and the moral significance associated with it as human life or vitality. St. Thomas made little comment on this subject, but Vagnoni seemed to have felt the need to introduce the contemporary Western belief in the attributes of blood and to include it in the *Personal Cultivation*. The Chinese formulation of the different types of physical nature that have a tendency toward evil, as well as the twin conceptions of purity and impurity, perfectly suits the traditional Western conception, at least on the surface.

Finally, it is important to examine the idea of *chih-ch'i* 志氣. This is a concept that does not really have a prominent philosophical importance in Neo-Confucian thinking. However, in Vagnoni's essay, it has a certain degree of importance (see 3/14). While discussing the human will (which he translates as *ai* 愛), Vagnoni says that there are two kinds of will: one is moved by *chih-ch'i* and the other by *hsüeh-ch'i*. This, of course, is based on St. Thomas' discussion on the will.[45] The will, according to St. Thomas, cannot but will the good. St. Thomas further explains the relationship between the will and the intellect. The relationship between the two is, as I understand it, a kind of mutual interaction.[46] However, "will" does give sensitive appetite the freedom (choice) to take certain movements that

45 *Summa*, I, Q. 82. See also Gilson, *op.cit.*, pp. 236-248.

46 The enormously complicated relationship between will and intellect is in *Summa*, I, Q. 82, art. 3&4; I-II, Q. 9, art. 9. Vagnoni tries to explain this relationship in 3/14. Incidentally, for my use of "interaction," see Gilson, *op.cit.*, p. 255.

may not direct toward the good. This point is one of the most difficult ideas in St. Thomas' attempt to explain the source of human freedom. In contrast, Vagnoni does not offer these complex theological discussions. Instead, he places emphasis on the will that interacts with the intellect, contrasting it to the will that is moved by sensitive appetite. Vagnoni states that the former is preferable to the latter; the former moves toward the general good and can magnify *i-li*[a], whereas the latter moves toward selfishness and can go against *i-li*[a].

Here, Vagnoni is clearly saying that the will that is moved by sensitive appetite is a bad kind of will, while that which is moved by the intellect is a good kind of will. Strictly speaking, Vagnoni's implication goes against St. Thomas' basic position. Vagnoni could not have been entirely oblivious to this fact. In St. Thomas' formulation, sensitive appetite does not, by nature, move the will toward evil; rather, it is when the will is not controlled by the intellect that sensitive appetite affects the will toward evil. St. Thomas' consistent care in denying the possibility for anything to be fundamentally and by nature evil is very clear. However, Vagnoni's interesting but puzzling decision to use *chih-ch'i* as the name of the action that belongs to the good kind of will suggests that, for him, *chih* is spiritual, in contrast to the corporeal. The *ch'i* that is corporeal he identifies as *hsüeh-ch'i*.[47] Of course, the general idea of such a distinction is quite understandable to the Chinese mind. It is not, however, a Thomist one. Thus, if Vagnoni is using these expressions in strictly Thomist sense, then the Chinese reader would

---

47 The difference between the spiritual and the corporeal, important as it is, seems to have not particularly bothered St. Thomas and therefore is found, as far as I can ascertain, only in I, Q. 75, art. 1-3. Vagnoni apparently uses *chüeh* 覺 to translate the corporeal and *chih* to translate spiritual or soul (3/14).

have to completely understand the terms anew.

The conclusion, therefore, is that Vagnoni's discussion on *hsüeh-ch'i*, while ostensibly based on Western concepts and reflecting the Thomist position on the potential moral inadequacy of sensitive appetite, is actually influenced by the Chinese thinking about physical nature, *ch'i-chih chih hsing*, which is considered as opposing the original goodness of human nature that is dictated by the principle. However, there is some twist here. The introduction of the term *hsüeh-ch'i*, which in Chinese actually means mere physical strength, leads to the new addition of the twin Chinese concepts of "pure" and "impure." These expressions were employed by Vagnoni to explain Western ideas about the different degrees of physical and moral vitality. For the Chinese, "pure" and "impure" merely describe the different states of physical nature that have the potential toward good or evil actions. There are no metaphysical implications in relation to human nature, as St. Thomas, and likewise Vagnoni, would have intended. This is the complicated nature of Vagnoni's struggle to interpret Christian ethics to the Chinese people. Because of the fundamental difference in premise (although the Chinese position was not entirely in opposition to that of St. Thomas), Vagnoni eventually yielded his position and used *hsüeh-ch'i* in an absolutely negative sense, while adopting the idea of *chih-ch'i* to interpret the source of moral good, thus abandoing St. Thomas' original position.

Conclusion

Vagnoni's attempts at teaching Chinese people Thomist theology and ethical ideas are a noble but obviously daunting task. From the discussion above, one sees how difficult it must have been for Vagnoni and his

associates in trying to abridge one of the most difficult theological works, let alone explaining it in Chinese. Many Chinese terms had to be invented, or be given new meaning, in order to express such difficult ideas as evil, sin, will, appetite, concupiscible and irascibibility. The result is a frustrating exercise in philosophical ambiguity. *Western Learning on Personal Cultivation* is an example *par excellence* of such a kind of semantic confusion. Even a well-educated Chinese scholar would find the work nearly impossible to understand. Since Vagnoni's other work, *Children's Education*, is plain, easy to read, and contains nearly no difficult ideas, one wonders if he had made a wrong decision in choosing to translate St. Thomas's work.

The interpretation or translation between two cultural traditions, as seen in Vagnoni's *Personal Cultivation*, does have its merit. I shall offer one little example to show how, ultimately, a book that is translated into another language will leave a mark on its readers. This concerns the contrast between *hsüeh-ch'i* and *chih-ch'i*. As I have demonstrated above, *hsüeh-ch'i* had long been widely used in the Chinese language to mean physical strength. On the other hand, the expression *chih-ch'i*, though not as rarely used as a compound, was never a philosophically loaded expression, and perhaps became even more rarely used in the middle period of Chinese history. In general, it meant ambition and physical disposition. After the rise of Neo-Confucianism, however, both *chih* and *ch'i* acquired new meanings. Yet the importance of *ch'i* as a metaphysical concept far surpassed *chih*. The compound, *chih-ch'i*, remains little changed in its traditional meaning.

It is then interesting to note that, about fifty years later, the K'ang-hsi Emperor would choose *chih-ch'i* over *hsüeh-ch'i* in describing his physical strength. In his old age, reflecting on health, he remarked: "I realized that this must be because in the days of our youth, our constitutions (*chih-ch'i*)

flourished, and water and fire were in balance; but as our constitutions weaken with age, the water can no longer overcome the fire.'"[48] Under normal circumstances, a Chinese would very likely have used *hsüeh-ch'i* to describe his personal physical constitution. But Emperor K'ang-hsi chose to use *chih-ch'i*. One wonders if by this time *chih-ch'i* had somewhat replaced *hsüeh-ch'i* as a preferred expression to describe one's strength, especially in connection with age and aging.

This will forever elude us. My point is that linguistic change is an all too common fact. The meaning of a word often changes when it is used to translate a foreign word. It would seem to me to be very natural that once *chih-ch'i* was introduced and used to contrast *hsüeh-ch'i* by leading official or influential people, such as the K'ang-hsi Emperor, and that once the former is considered to be a preferable human trait than the latter, then people would begin to use the former, even though the latter is a more correct expression within the Chinese intellectual tradition. Perhaps Vagnoni's *Personal Cultivation* was indeed widely circulated and affected the Chinese expression of physical strength, so much so that by K'ang-hsi's time, *chih-ch'i* had become a preferred expression to *hsüeh-ch'i*.

Although few Chinese thinkers mentioned their relationship to Western missionaries, let alone their exchanges of ideas with them, it is commonly known that in the seventeenth century, Western missionaries did choose to befriend Confucian scholars, and some of them seemed to have made serious efforts at learning Confucian thought. In the discussion above, it appears that Vagnoni had achieved some preliminary understanding of the scholarship

---

48 Jonathan D. Spence, *Emperor of China, Self-portrait of K'ang-his* (New York: Vintage Books, 1975), p. 111, citing *T'ing-hsün ko-yen*, 43b. cf. *Ta-Ch'ing Sheng-tsu Jen Huang-ti shih-lu* (Taipei: Hua-wen shu-chu reprint, 1964), 273/5b.

that we usually associate with the so-called Kuan-learning (learning of Shen-hsi, represented above all by Hsüeh Hsüan). This might be because Chiang-chou of Shan-hsi is close to Shen-hsi. But more importantly, it was probably due to the revival in the monistic approach to the relationship between principle and material force. The reorientation of the Neo-Confucian approach to the issue, which had implications for the discussions on the relationship between heavenly principle and humanly desire, actually occurred before the arrival of Catholic missionaries. However, the missionaries could not have come in a better time. It was in this environment that Vagnoni's writings, which incidentally had also been carefully edited and promoted by the members of a locally prominent Han family,[49] reached a wide readership. As Vagnoni's writings spread, some of the ideas that he introduced began to affect and enrich Chinese thinking, adding a greater range of meanings to many Chinese words. The same must have also happened to the writings of many other Catholic missionaries. While by the mid-eighteenth century, most Western philosophical works published by missionaries (including those by Vagnoni) were being disparaged as unimportant and even harmful, certain ideas had already penetrated Chinese thinking.[50] This full story awaits a more systematic exploration.

Vagnoni died in 1640 and was buried in Chiang-chou.

---

49 See Fang Hao, *Chung-kuo T'ien-chu chiao shih jen-wu chuan*, vol. 1, pp. 253-258 for the biographies of the Hans.

50 See my "Christianity and Chinese Intellectuals, 16th-18th Centuries," in my (ed.), *China and Europe, Images and Influences in Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1991), pp. 1-27.

Changing Literati Attitudes toward New Learning in Astronomy and Mathematics in Early Qing

Willard J. Peterson
Professor of Department of East Asian Studies, Princeton University

In the 1670s, Gu Yanwu顧炎武(1613-1682), who was already establishing himself as the premier scholar of evidential research in his generation, a reputation that would be sustained even to the present day, recorded some verbal comments purportedly made by Li Lu李鑪of Jingle靜樂in Shanxi. According to Gu Yanwu, Li was familiar with what Gu specifically named as Learning from the Western Ocean(*xiyang zhi xue*西洋之學). Gu was quoting Li's explanation of what the adherents of Western learning said about lunar eclipses. "The moon originates no light of its own. Its shining light is borrowed from the sun's brilliance. At the time in the month of the full moon, it is in a straight line with the earth and the sun. The moon sees the earth and does not see the sun. This is when it has no [reflected] light."

This is a straightforward, if overly simplified, explanation for a non-specialist.

An objection was raised to Mr. Li. Someone said(and I am inclined to infer that it was not Gu Yanwu himself), "That is not so. Once at the time of a lunar eclipse, it ought to have been after sunset, but the sun still had not sunk and the moon, coming out from [the plane of] the earth, was already eclipsing. In the east the moon was beginning to ascend. In the west the sun was not set. As we saw both of them, one may not say that the earth actually was interposed between the sun and the moon. How can they [i.e., the men from the Western Oceans] say [that an eclipse occurs because the moon] sees that earth but does not see the sun?" This is an appeal to perceptual experience against an obviously non-intuitive theoretical explanation. Li Lu was tactful in his response, as reported by Gu Yanwu. Li did not deny the claim that someone had seen an eclipsing moon before the sun had set. Li said, "What you saw was not the moon. It was the reflection of the moon. The moon actually had not come out from the earth. How do we test this?" Li gave the example of a coin that is hidden inside an empty cup while its reflection can be seen on the surface if the cup is filled with water. In the case cited by his interlocutor, Li argued, when the sun is about to set, the air in the eastern sky is moist and reflects the moon's image, just as the surface of the water reflects the image of the coin in the bottom of the cup, but we should not mistakenly take the reflection to be the moon itself. Similar examples are seeing on the surface of water the refracted, displaced image of a fish that is under the water, or a boat-pole looking as if it were bent where it enters the water. Li concluded, "As these are so, then how can one doubt [a lunar eclipse is caused by the sun's

light to] the moon being cut off by the earth."[1] Gu recorded no further comment. Li's argument on behalf of the Western theory, we should notice, is intended to refute a claim based on the test of personal experience(*yan*验) with a counter-claim based on experience (or at least a thought experiment) rather than on textual evidence, as is characteristic throughout Gu Yanwu's famous book.

In Gu's entry on solar eclipses, he drew on contemporary experience to supplement historical textual evidence. He did not give even a minimum physical explanation, such as he reported for lunar eclipses. Gu cited the comment of the despicable Liu Xiang 刘向 of the Han dynasty on the frequency of solar eclipses. During the 242 years(722-481) covered by the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, thirty six solar eclipses are recorded, but, said Liu Xiang, in the twenty years following the Jianshi 建始 reign.(32-29 B.C.E), there were eight, or an average of one every two years and six months. Left unstated, of course, was the implication that all of those eclipses were foreshadowing the fall of the Han dynasty and it replacement by Wang Mang 王莽, Liu Xiang's patron. Gu Yanwu pointed out that from antiquity to the present, generally solar eclipses were rarely observed, and the differences among them were more a matter of appearances--total, partial, frequency, and so on. Gu continued, "From what was observed in the Chongzhen reign(1628-1644), there were eight eclipses in twenty-seven years." Gu drew a parallel. "This is generally comparable to the [end of the]

1 Gu Yanwu, "Yue shi 月食", *Ri zhi lu ji shi*, 30. 4-5. Also in *Yuan chao ben Ri zhi lu*, 30.856-7. According to Zhang Mu, *Gu Tinglin nianpu*, 3.5b-21b, Gu was in Jingle several times after 1671, and he probably met Li Lu there. Zhang Mu speculated that when Gu gave away his concubine in 1677, it was to Li Lu(3.21b). Gu also corresponded with Wang Xishan from Jingle in 1673.

Han, and exceeded it in frequency [i.e., two in one year and three in two years; Gu presumably did not mean the average was higher]. This being so, then, as for saying that solar eclipses are determinate in their numbers and unrelated to human affairs, isn't that merely being mired in the techniques of mathematicians(*chou ren*疇人) and not being aware that they are following in the tracks of the theories of deviant officials(*xie chen*邪臣)?"[2]

Gu Yanwu was not doubting the idea that solar eclipses were determinate in their numbers(*yiding zhi shu*一定之數) and therefore predictable. It was the other part he was doubting. He brought out his point by quoting the *Zuo Commentary* to the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, which recorded a solar eclipse in the 21st year of Duke Zhao昭公.[3] The Duke asked if the eclipse was felicitous or troubling, and his attendant officer claimed that an eclipse occurring at the time of the solstices or equinoxes was not calamitous; only those in other months were. Gu Yanwu said that was wrong, and explained: "The positions of the sun and the moon in the sky are always determinate in their numbers. Nevertheless," Gu continued, "celestial figures are seen on high, and human affairs respond down below." This is the point Gu wanted to save. For centuries there had been officials, as in the *Zuo Commentary* example, who reassured their rulers and did not use manifestations in the sky as the occasion to correct them. They would say such things as the eclipse is insignificant and is not leading to a major catastrophe, only flood or drought. Gu, of course, had the fall of a dynasty in mind, and he concluded, "For this reason, equinoxes and solstices are

2 Gu Yanwu, "Ri shi日食," *Ri zhi lu ji shi*, 30.3-4, which I follow, rather than the uncorrected *Yuan chao ben*, 855-856.

3 The eclipse occurred on 3 June 520 B.C.E. See James Legge, trans., *Chinese Classics*, vol. 5, 685-686.

irrelevant to the baleful sign that is a solar eclipse."[4]

Gu overrode the mathematicians' theory of determinate, and therefore predictable, numbers for eclipses to sustain two political points. First, that a spate of solar eclipses was observed in the years before the fall of the Han and the fall of the Ming dynasties, and second, that maintaining a theory that eclipses are *simply* a matter of numerically determinable cycles and positions puts one in league with "deviant officials," implicitly including the recently denounced Adam Schall von Bell. Gu Yanwu refused to relegate the import of solar eclipses to the merely mathematical; even if there is no physical connection between phenomena in the sky and events on earth(and Gu did not explicitly maintain there is), history shows, he implied, that there is a political connection. One of the later commentators(probably Lu Longchi 陸瓏其[1630-1693]) who was cited for this passage in Gu's book wrote that, "In Western learning they absolutely do not speak of verification by predictions (*zhan yan* 占驗). Their theory regards solar and lunar eclipses and movements of the five planets all as constant paths and constant degrees. How can what is so evidenced be used for questions of felicitous or troubling?, [they ask]. This is proximate to [Zhu Xi's claims for constant, universal, a priori] coherence." But, the commentator went on, even if the seven celestial bodies have such constancy, they are constituents in a complex of *qi* in motion, along with dynastic states and ordinary people. The latter must be affected. And we know astrologers' predictions for ordinary people can be subtly verified, so how much more must be the case for such a major matter as the mandate for a dynasty?, he asked in rhetorical support of Gu Yanwu's position. Besides, he added, it may be that the purveyors of

4 "Ri shi," 30.4.

Western learning merely were being cautious in not speaking of astrology.[5] Leaving aside the issue of whether the comment reflects the public' being unaware that missionaries serving at the Qing court dealt in astrological as well as astronomical and calendrical predications, we can see that Gu Yanwu himself was challenging the disconnection between celestial occurrences and human affairs without requiring belief in the prognostications of astrology based on a strong correlative theory.[6]

What Gu Yanwu was intending may be clearer if we go back to the entry on lunar eclipses and examine Gu's own comment.

"A solar eclipse is the moon concealing the sun [from the earth]. A lunar eclipse is the earth concealing the moon [from the sun]. This is the theory in the astronomy from the Western Oceans(*xiyang tianwen*西洋天文). We already had this formulation from before [the Westerners'] methods entered China."[7] To make his point, Gu cited a jotting by Lu Shen陸深 (1477-1544), an official and prolific writer. Lu noted, "I have heard that those in the Western regions [presumably refering to Islamic lands rather than Christendom] who calculate solar and lunar eclipses say that the sun and moon are the same size as the earth, and if the body of the earth exactly conceals the sun on its circuit, then the moon is eclipsed."[8] This does not

---

5 Note by Lu, added to "Ri shi," 30.4

6 See my discussion of the turn away from intellectual commitment to effective correlative thinking in my review of John Henderson, "evelopment and Decline of Chinese Cosmology," in *HJAS* 46.2(1986), esp. p. 664. The editors of the *Ming shi* in the introduction to the "Wu xing zhi" 五行志 treatise take a stance which is similar to Gu Yanwu's on the residual political importance of celestial events; there may be mutual influences between heaven and humans which are a function of *tonglei*同類, but the evidence is not sufficient to include them. *Ming shi*, 28.425.

7 "Yue shi," 30.4.

8 "Yue shi," See Lu Shen, *Jintai ji wen, xia*, 2b-3a.

seem to be much of a precedent for knowledge of the accurate method of eclipse prediction published by Jesuit missionaries in Gu Yanwu's lifetime. Gu cited a more detailed explanation of eclipses by Wan Shi 萬實 of Nancheng南城. "The ecliptic is evenly divided, so for each place, at exactly 182 and 1/2 degrees, the opposite place on the path must be concealed [from the sun's light] by the earth. If the moon is full and in its movement precisely crosses the ecliptic, it is exactly in opposition to the sun, and thus the earth conceals the sun's light and the moon is eclipsed."[9] This is a neat explanation, the clearest Gu cited. Gu's own further comment is telling. "This theory also did not begin in more recent times." To support his point, Gu Yanwu quoted Zhang Heng張衡 of the Han dynasty. "On the path of the sun, when the sun's light is not paired [with the moon], it is being shaded by the earth. This [position on the sun's path] is called the dark hollow(*an xu*闇虛) in the stars. When the moon passes where the stars are weak, it is eclipsed."[10] Gu Yanwu went on to speculate that there had been a now lost detailed theory involving the concept of the 'dark hollow' in the sky. Gu's three examples, read singly or together, seem to be weak foundations for supporting his claim that "We already had this formulation [about eclipses] from before [the Westerners'] methods entered China."

No one would argue that Gu Yanwu had the fullest and most accurate understanding of eclipses in the third quarter of the seventeenth century. But neither would anyone want to argue that he was a neglible scholar who was casual about what he included as the notes which became his most famous book, *Record of Knowledge Gained Day by Day*. He did not aim to be

9 "Yue shi," 30.4. I have not identified Wan Shi.
10 "Yue shi," 30.4-5.

comprehensive. He could have omitted the two entries on solar and lunar eclipses and his readers would not have noticed. So it is worth asking, what was his intention? What is the noteworthy information he was conveying in these two entries? He has nothing to add for any of his contemporaries who wanted a detailed explanation of phenomena such as eclipses or other aspects of astronomy and its associated mathematical techniques. That was available from other books and teachers.

With his gathering prestige, Gu Yanwu was promoting two ideas: (1) the apparent certainty of calculated numbers miss what is important in our historical record of the phenomenal world, and (2) the textual tradition is more important than the new knowledge recently brought by Westerners and patronized by the emperor. Here, and in all of Gu's writing, the implicit claim is that "important" is a function of relevance to ongoing cultural processes and values.

Gu Yanwu's comments evoke what I would call the issue of universality. In Zhu Xi's Learning of the Way, the concept of *li* 理 (coherence) was by explicit definition universal in the sense of being unitary in its extension throughout the phenomenal world. *Li* is always *li* through all time and space. Coherence is unitary however and wherever it is manifested, even if it is most readily accessible to us in the Four Books, the foundation of Zhu Xi's prescription for learning. Although Zhu Xi made every effort to subordinate "numbers"(*shu*), as he construed them, to his concept of *li*, others pressed the claim, even as it is today, that mathematics is universally so. The sum of 3 and 4, or the value of the ratio of a circle's circumference to half its diameter, or the sum of the interior angles of a plane triangle are universally so and do not vary according to local practice at any particular time, even though how they are articulated may. A third expression of

universality is the claim that we are all under one sky, or, to put it in more current terms, that we all live in a singular universe which since its inception has always been comprised of the same general physical processes. This third claim carries the implication that we all are able to have shared experiential knowledge(e.g., we all can observe the same lunar eclipse, given the physical opportunity, although at different angles and different local times).

Gu Yanwu did not directly attempt to refute any of these three expressions of claims with presumptions of universality. Others had argued against Zhu Xi's concept of *li*(as coherence) as somehow existing externally to our minds, whether we comprehend it or not, by interpreting *li* as patterns or principles which humans impute to phenomena.[11] Gu implicitly stood against universal *li*(coherence) by stressing history--changes over time in the records of his cultural tradition. Gu Yanwu's famous dictum was, "[As distinguished from what he called Chan, or Zen, inspired learning, *true*] learning based on principles is learning based on our classics"(*li xue, jing xue ye*理學，經學也).[12] This shifts *li* away from being the universal coherence that is to discerned everywhere, whether in a blade of grass, or in the processes to be observed in the sky, or in texts inherited from sages of antiquity, or in our own pure minds. Gu's stance is a dissent, as well, both from the claims for mathematics(numbers which are determinate, *yiding zhi shu*, and the techniques of the mathematicians, *chou ren*) and from the claim that the cosmos, or more to the point, all the various parts of the inhabited

11 For example, see Wang Tingxiang(1474-1544), "Da Xue Junzai lun xing shu,"答薛君采論性書 *Wang Tingxiang ji*, 28.517-520.

12 Gu Yanwu, *Gu Tinglin shi wen ji*, "Yu Shi Yushan與施愚山," 3.62. Gu stressed that the term *li xue* was a Song invention, so his claim was that if we are to use the term *li xue*, we should understand that in the past what was called *li xue* was *jing xue*, classical learning, and that what in his day was called *li xue* was in fact Chan learning.

Earth, are homogenous. (To illustrate what is at stake here, I suggest we think analogically not about "laws" of physics but about whether human "rights" are universal in their application.)

Gu's dictum implies that the cultural tradition stemming from the classics has greater import than the new methods(*xin fa*新法) presented by Westerners' learning related to astronomy and mathematics. Gu's attitude marks a subtle shift from previous generations' views of the essential importance of "universals."

To be sure, in late Ming attitudes somewhat similar to Gu Yanwu's about the "universality" of mathematics and astronomy were expressed. Xu Guangqi and Li Zhicao in their prefaces stressed precedents in the Chinese tradition for the new learning from the West.[13] In the 1640s Fang Kongzhao 方孔炤(1591-1655) wrote the *Chongzhen lishu yue*崇禎曆書約(Precis on Books on the Chongzhen Calendar). In discussing the theory of a nine-layered sky (*tian jiu chong*天九重), a traditional term that Jesuits adapted to refer to the theory of nine concentric heavenly spheres, and the theory that the Earth is like an orb, Fang stressed that these ideas had been articulated since ancient times by various sage and accomplished men. Similarly, earlier methods of calculation did not derive from recently introduced methods of geometry. "These developments came first, and it was only later that [astronomy and mathematics] became more detailed."[14] Like Fang Kongzhao, many writers made it clear that the new knowledge was an advance in clarity

13 Peter Engelfriet, *Euclid in China*, 289-297.

14 Fang Kongzhao, "Chongzhen lishu yue," in *Zhou yi tuxiang ji biao*, 7.1b-2a(pp. 592-593). Also quoted in Fung Kanwing(Feng Jinrong), "Mingmo Qingchu Fang shi xuepai zhi chengli ji qi zhuzhang," *Kyōto daigaku jinbun kagaku kenkyūjō kenkyū hokoku*, 1989, 186.

and detail, and they urged that it should take its place in the repertoire of learned men. Western learning could be, in Xu Guangqi's celebrated phrase, a supplement to true Confucian learning. Opposition to Western learning merely on the grounds of its being Western went nowhere in late Ming. The compilation known as *Po xie ji*(破邪集 Against Deviating) of 1639 was quickly forgotten and almost lost. There were many individuals, no doubt, who did not like the Jesuit missionaries, their converts or their allies, and who oppossed them. Many problems were raised and reservations expressed, as the example of Fang Yizhi shows. Nevertheless, the process of adapting and assimilating Western-based learning on astronomy and mathematics published in Chinese continued on the highest levels over the last two decades of the Ming dynasty and into Qing.

An early Qing example of assimilation that may serve is the *Clarification of [Methods of] Numbers and Magnitudes*(*Shu du yan* 數度衍)by Fang Zhongtong方中通(1633-1698), second son of Fang Yizhi(1611-1671). His book, probably completed around 1660 and printed in 1687, contains more than 24 *juan* on methods for solving problems in arithmetic, geometry and algebra.[15] It was drawn from both Western and Chinese sources and techniques without attributions and presented without labels. Although the book opens with material based on the River Diagram(*Ho tu*河圖)and Lo Writing(*Lo shu*洛書), the impression given in Fang's book is that mathematics is mathematics, whether learning to use an abacus to add or using decimal numbers in columns. The reader can choose his methods without prejudice.

For two of Fang Zhongtong's more recognized generational contemporaries,

15 Fang Zhongtong, *Shu du yan*. See Fung Kanwing(Feng Jinrong), "Fang Zhongtong ji qi *Shu du yan*," *Lun heng* 2.1(1995), 128-204, and, Peter Engelfriet, *Euclid in China*, 362-371.

the approach was different.

Wang Xishan王錫闡(1628-1682) was acquainted with Gu Yanwu, and they died the same year. Compared to Gu, Wang lived quietly in Suzhou and was relatively unknown until nearly a century after his death, when some of his writings on mathematics and astronomy were printed. As a number of authors have stressed, Wang repeatedly drew out or marked differences between Western and Chinese learning, "The patterns(*li* 理) behind astronomical phenomena are unitary, but when numbers are put to them, then there are differences between the Chinese and Western ones. The Westerners are able to explain the patterns contained in these numbers, but are not able to explain why the patterns are identical. Confucians [who follow Zhu Xi's lead] each go on about numbers being external to the patterns, but are not able to clarify why the numbers [used in Western and Chinese astronomy] are different. This is why the two are not mutually comprehensible after so many rears."[16] Wang wrote that he wanted to reconcile the two because there is only one sky, but in an important sense he did not start by looking to the sky to achieve a new, unified system. He looked to the past, as did Gu Yanwu. Wang wrote, "We understand that the Western theories [in astronomy] originated in Chinese learning(*zhong xue*). They did not think them up."[17] This is a stronger formulation than Gu's attempts to find precedents for the new ideas about eclipses.

Also like Gu Yanwu, Wang Xishan articulated his felt need to correct his contemporaries who misunderstood the relation between the new knowledge introduced from the West and methods previously present in the

16 Wang Xishan, *Xiaoan yi shu*曉庵遺書, "Za zhu"雜著, "Li shuo"歷說, *yi*, as quoted in Zhang Yongtang, *Mingmo Qingchu lixue yu kexue guanxi zai lun*, 204.

17 *Ibid*., li shuo, wu, quoted in Zhang Yongtang, 204-205.

textual tradition. Wang wrote, "The inferiority of our old methods to Western learning [in astronomy and mathematics] is not because the methods are not alike; it is that there was no one who examined and clarified the ideas behind the [old] methods. Now when we investigate what is estimable in Western astronomy(*xi li*西曆), it is no more than points involving numbers(*shu duan* 數端)." The implication of Wang's comment is that the new astronomy may be more mathematical than "our old methods," but the latter were not, therefore, to be discarded. In Wang's account, "Mathematicians and their students were shocked at what they were to study, and scholars and officials were delighted with the marvels [of Western astronomy. When they learned some,] they showed off to each other, thinking earlier times did not have [what they had learned]. Who among them understood that these points involving numbers [in Western astronomy] were all contained within the old methods and were not something [the Westerners] alone had apprehended?"[18] Although Wang may not have intended a criticism of the Kangxi Emperor here--he may not have been aware that the emperor was devoting time in the 1670s to learning about the new knowledge in mathematics and astronomy from Verbiest[19],--Wang clearly sought to criticize his contemporaries who were learning the new ideas and neglecting the knowledge concerning astronomy and mathematics in Chinese texts produced before Ricci's arrival in Beijing.

Wang Xishan's self-invented agenda was for he himself, and others he hoped to influence, to investigate, understand, and assess the strengths and weaknesses of both old and new systems of astronomy. What would be the

18 *Wang Xishan wen ji*, "Li ze" 歷策, as quoted in Zhang Yongtang, 205.

19 Song Dexuan, *Kangxi sixiang yanjiu*, 169-170.

basis for assessing? Unlike Gu Yanwu, who relied on texts and rarely appealed to experiential knowledge, Wang Xishan argued that it would, or should, be based on our experience of celestial phenomena. "What should we follow to do this?", he asked. "We will follow what is in the sky. What the men of earlier times said [about astronomy] ought to accord with the sky as we seek to combine [what is correct in both the old and the new]; we ought not combine them in order to experience(*yan* 驗) the sky. [Different] methods have variants, and we must inquire into the causes of the variants. Methods have congruities, and we should be concerned about the causes of the merely fortuitous ones. [In astronomy,] the longer investigations are pursued, the more accurate the numbers become, and the more refined our thinking, the more the patterns emerge, so we use earlier methods as the standard and gain more competence from the celestial processes."[20] By using astronomical instruments to make more precise observations, men could surpass the astronomy of recent times, Wang argued. Wang Xishan's position was that of a modern, as was Gu Yanwu's, in the sense that we can know more than our ancestors in matters involving cumulative knowledge. But unlike Gu, Wang Xishan urged that we could look to the phenomenal world for his evidence. Wang's claim that we should "follow what is in the sky," which would be fundamentally scientific, in the sense of modern science, was not itself followed. His call for investigation of earlier texts on learning in astronomy and mathematics was.

The approach of Mei Wending梅文鼎(1633-1721) to Western learning in astronomy and mathematics may best be described as gradual and in stages. The first stage was from about 1660 to 1675. Mei seems to have

20 Wang Xishan, "Li ze".

become involved in serious study of mathematical and astronomical texts and techniques in his late twenties, the early 1660s.[21] Mei was preparing for the examinations in these years, although he never succeeded in passing at the provincial level. At the same time he was learning about calendar systems and earlier mathematics. From his interest in the latter, Mei made the acquaintance of Fang Zhongtong in Nanjing in 1669, and he also knew Pan Lei潘耒(1646-1708), who became Gu Yanwu's student that year. In the late spring of 1671 Fang Yizhi, who was living as a Buddhist in a temple in Ji'an 吉安prefecture in Jiangxi, sent a letter to Mei Wending discussing work on the tradition of learning involving figures(*xiang*象) and numbers(*shu*數).[22] At about the same time, Fang made two landscape paintings to send to Gu Yanwu,who was in Shanxi.[23] By 1674 Mei Wending had completed the draft of one of his most famous mathematical works, *On Equations*(*Fang cheng lun*方程論). In a note attached to some poems he wrote for Fang Zhongtong, Mei said, "Fang has gone into the essentials of Western learning, but I have been distressed that the learned men(*ru*) from the West are pushing out our ancient methods of numbers and calculating, so I wrote *On Equations*. I mean to say that Ricci had nothing more difficult, and thus I wanted to show this to Fang."[24] Although it was not printed until 1687,[25] Mei's book marked the culmination of the first stage, when Mei was mainly concerned with recovering mathematical learning produced before the time of Ricci.

---

21 Li Di and Guo Shirong, *Mei Wending*, 20-21.

22 Ren Daobin, *Fang Yizhi nianpu*, 267.

23 *Ibid.*

24 Quoted from Xu Changzhi徐昌治, ed., *WanQing yishi hui*晚晴簃詩匯(Tianjin: Xu shi Degengtang kanben徐氏得耕堂刊本, 1929), 38.12a, in Feng Jinrong, "Mingmo Qingchu Fang shi xuepai zhi chengli ji chi zhuzhang," 205.

25 Li and Guo, 23 and 27; see Mei's explanation of the term *fangcheng* in *ibid.*, 118.

Mei's investigations of works on arithmetic, geometry and algebra involved him in comparisons with what had been introduced by the missionaries and what he found or reconstructed from the past. He conceded the value of the Westerners' understanding of geometry-based astronomy and the accumulation of detailed, accurate celestial observations, all under the rubric of "methods of measuring"(*liang fa*量法). But Mei sought to show the advantages, and superiority, of "techniques of calculating"(*suan shu* 算術) from the Chinese tradition,[26] not just the speed and facility of the abacus and calculating rods, but the problem-solving power of the methods he presented in *On Equations*. This distinction was the basis for Mei's claim for the independent importance of Chinese mathematics alongside the Westerners'. He could leave issues of priority aside.[27]

During the years of what I label as the second stage, from 1675 to 1688, Mei Wending's agenda seems to have been to merge the two aspects--methods of measuring and techniques of calculating--especially in their applications in astronomy. This task involved Mei in more work on the Westerners' astronomical and calendrical texts that had been supported by the Qing government. In Nanjing in 1675, Mei procured a set of the *New Methods Astronomy Books*(*Xin fa lishu*新法曆書).[28] As Mei pursued his studies on topics in astronomy, including the Westerners', he developed competence in spherical geometry, which by 1684 had become a book he called *Essentials of Spherical Geometry*(*Husanjiao juyao*弧三角舉要).[29] In

26 Mei was first to draw this distinction, according to Li and Guo, 196.

27 Mei Wending, *Fang cheng lun*(in *Siku chuanshu*, vol. 495), 64-65; also quoted in Chu Ping-yi, 165-166.

28 Li and Guo, 24; Chu Ping-yi, *Wan-nan scholars and the recasting of Jesuit astronomy 1600-1800*, 161-162.

29 Li and Guo, 29.

contrast to his *On Equations*, the *Essentials* is clearly modeled on Western mathematics. In Mei's view, though, he was achieving a kind of synthesis; in his preface he said he was extracting the critical points, paring away superfluities, and bringing out the logical reasoning inherent in Western geometry.[30] He said he was combining Yuan-dynasty geometry and Western-Oceans' geometry to form a new standard, and with his models and diagrams he had turned what was so difficult to understand in the old texts into methods that were as straightforward as pointing to one's palm.[31] In this respect, and at this stage, Mei Wending was carrying out what Wang Xishan proposed: a kind of synthesis. Mei only learned of Wang's ideas after Wang was dead, but even into the 1680s they both stood on the two legs of Western and Chinese learning.

Mei Wending's work changed after 1689, when he went to Beijing and became in effect a protege of Li Guangdi 李光地 (1642-1718). In his writings from that third stage, the theme of Chinese origins comes out strongly, and later was read back into his previous work. Mei could still write in the 1690s, in his *Answers on Astronomy* (*Lixue dawen* 曆學答問), a simple retort allowing a clear Western provenance. "The theory that a lunar eclipse is the shadow of the earth originated in the Far West. It can be shocking when you suddenly hear someone say it, but careful investigation shows it is solidly evidenced. Nevertheless, its basis must be deeply examined through the learning of astronomy, and then one understands that this theory is not false."[32] This is an answer from authority rather than personal experience (*yan*) or theory. Mei's real answer is his short treatise explaining lunar

30 Quoted in Li and Guo, 173.

31 Quoted in Li and Guo, 180.

32 Mei Wending, *Mei shi congshu jiyao*, 59.25a-b.

eclipses.[33] He explained the terms, showed all the factors which must be taken into account, and added a diagram showing the five phases of an eclipse. He still, however, without apology pointed out that this new explanation originated in the Western Ocean countries.[34]

Compared to Mei Wending, Wang Xishan, Fang Zhongtong, Huang Zongxi, and a cluster of other early Qing figures, perhaps including the Kangxi emperor, Gu Yanwu's knowledge of learning in mathematics and astronomy as expressed in his writings was slim. Mei, Wang, and Fang demonstrated a technical competence involving numbers in both Chinese and Western learning much more powerful than Gu's nodding acquaintance. They recognized strengths and weaknesses in both. They were willing to juxtapose, if not merge them, at least until the 1680s. But then Gu Yanwu's attitude began to come to the fore. It is apparent that in the eighteenth century the process of investigating, and the values to be derived from, texts of the historical tradition are more important than inquiries involving numbers or observable phenomena that are the experiential basis of astronomical learning, especially as conveyed in the new methods brought by the Westerners over the previous century and confirmed in place by the Kangxi emperor in 1669.[35]

---

33 *Mei shi congshu jiyao*, 53.

34 *Ibid.*, 54.1a.

35 In contrast to my interpretation, John Henderson, "Ch'ing Scholars' Views of Western Astronomy," *HJAS* 46.1(1986), suggests "... major eighteenth-century scholars actually cultivated wider scientific interests than did their seventeenth-century predecessors."(p.139) To support his suggestion, Henderson points to their "exhaustive studies of the classics of the native scientific tradition."(p.140) Our differing interpretations seem to turn to what we mean by "scientific interests." Although the boundary may be blurred, investigating the history of scientific thinking is not in the same category as pursuing research science; investigating the history of mathematics is not in the same category as advancing mathematical knowledge.

It is less apparent *why* this shift in intellectual interest took place when it did. The cluster of books dealing with new knowledge in mathematics and astronomy is at least comparable in quality and contemporary influence to the books produced through the 1670s demonstrating the new fashion in learning based on textual evidence(*kaozheng xue*). Led by Verbiest, Jesuits serving at court were better prepared in mathematics than before. An active emperor was personally interested in the new learning, and promoted it in the 1670s and over the next two or three decades. Without addressing Needham's claim that by the end of the seventeenth century, thinking in China about the phenomenal world--the ten thousand things in the realm of heaven-and-earth--had merged with what he calls "oecumenical science," I am inclined toward a variety of other authors who have generally observed that in the eighteenth century the ethos of learning based on textual evidence attracted more interest and energy than investigation contributing to the acquisition of new knowledge in mathematics and astronomy.

Gu Yanwu's influential role in the development of evidential learning (*kaozheng xue*)also has been acknowledged generally by historians for three hundred years. However, it is not usual to assign him a role--whether as catalyst, cause, or even symptom--in the turn away from new knowledge in mathematics and astronomy. But circumstantial evidence leads me to situate Gu at the beginning of the change. The entries from the 1670s on lunar and solar eclipses in his *Record of Knowledge Gained Day by Day* demonstrate (1) his stance against placing confidence in the certainty of the numerical constants used in astronomical prediction over recognition of the historical significance of celestial events, (2) his citing earlier(Chinese) precedents for new ideas recently introduced from the West, and (3) his affiliation with some of the diverse seventeenth-century emphases on particulars rather than

universals.

In the third month of 1678 a special recruitment examination for scholars was announced. The *Bo xue hong ru*博學鴻儒 examination was taken in the third month of 1679 by 150 or so candidates who had been nominated by high Qing officials. One of the two main parts was to write a *fu* 賦(an archaic formal descriptive prose genre) on a four-character phrase--*xuan ji yu heng*璿璣玉衡--which named some sort of astronomical instruments in the "Shun dian"舜典 section of the *Book of Documents*.[36] This examination task, which calls for the candidate to demonstrate detailed knowledge of the classical text and its historical context related to a sage ruler's concern with celestial observation, stands in contrast to the detailed knowledge represented by the perpetual calendar which Verbiest submitted to the Kangxi Emperor in 1678. The one was backward looking, classical, textual, historical, and recondite; the other was forward looking, numerical, experiential, and available for broad social use. Gu Yanwu evaded being recommended for the 1679 examination. Several of his students and acquaintances took it, but they were not the most significant means to his having an influence on attitudes.

Gu Yanwu had three nephews who passed the *jinshi* examination at the highest level: Xu Yuanwen 徐元文(1634-91), the highest ranked *jinshi* in 1659: Xu Qianxue徐乾學(1631-94), who ranked third in 1670; and Xu Bingyi徐秉義(1633-1711), the third-ranked *jinshi* in 1673. Although they were home in Kunshan to mourn their mother(Gu Yanwu's sister) from late

36 *Da Qing Shengzu ren huangdi shi lu*, 80.1b. Li Fusun, *Hezheng qian lu*(*Zhao dai congshu*, 1833), 5ab. Also see the discussion in Chu Ping-yi, 150-153. In the *Book of Documents*, the first thing Shun is recorded as doing after he takes over rule following Yao's abdication is to examine these "astronomical instruments," if that is what they were.

in 1676 to 1678, the three brothers served as high officials and in succession as directors of the project to compile the *Ming History*. Staffing the History Bureau was one of the main purposes of the special examination of 1679. From 1690 on, Xu Qianxue, dismissed from office and living in Suzhou prefecture, was the private patron of a handful of the outstanding *kaozheng* scholars of the time.[37] In 1695 the full version in 32 *juan* of Gu Yanwu's *Record of Knowledge Gained Day by Day* was printed. Evidential learning was being launched outside of the purview of the Kangxi Emperor.

Why would the emperor, an administrator involved in the details of government if ever there was one, tolerate this shift after he had invested personally in learning about mathematics and astronomy from his employees from the Far West? Leaving aside that he was extraordinarily politic, the Kangxi Emperor listened to Li Guangdi. Li had been embarassed by the emperor's knowledge of mathematics, and perhaps in self defense or retaliation Li had introduced Mei Wending to court(and in the process transformed Mei's thinking). As Gu Yanwu had done decades earlier, Li Guangdi objected to the Westerners' "objectification" of celestial phenomena such as eclipses. Li argued that heaven(*tian* 天) interacts with humans just as the emperor(*tianzi* 天子) interacts with his subjects, which implies that to deny the one is to cast doubt on the other relationship.[38] Li was instrumental in the Kangxi Emperor's turn away from Jesuits. Li also had a major role in promoting Zhu Xi's learning with imperially-sponsored editions of works by and proximate to Zhu Xi and

37 See Lynn Struve, "The Hsu Brothers and Semiofficial Patronage of Scholars in the K'ang-hsi Period," *HJAS* 42.1(1982), 231-266.

38 Quoted in Hou Wailu et al., *Song Ming lixue shi*, vol. 2, 1019.

lixue.[39] What had been the new knowledge of mathematics and astronomy was codified in the encyclopedic compilations printed in 1723 under the general title of *Lü li yuan yuan*(律歷淵源Origins of music and calendars). The more than 50 *juan* on mathematics, entitled *Shu li jing yun*(數理精蘊 Collected Essentials on Numbers and Principles), presented the River Diagram and Lo Writing as foundational for all mathematics. It also included edited versions of the Euclid translation and other Western mathematical works without any attached indication of authorship. The introduction to the collection was a brief discussion on the origins of numbers and principles which opened with the claim that "Numerical learning fathoms the principles of the ten thousand things." This concept was imputed to the sages and exemplified through history. Although it goes against Zhu Xi, the introduction asserted, "From this we understand that learning involving calculating and numbers is actually the crucial part of 'investigating things and extending knowledge.'"[40] The introductory comments for the third mathematical text, the *Zhou bi jing jie*(周髀經解 Explanatory Comments on the Zhou Gnomen Classic), reviewed the decline in mathematical learning since antiquity and recognized that a few individuals from the Western Ocean region with skills in mathematics had been coming to the Central Land (*Zhong tu*中土) since late Ming; they had detailed mathematical knowledge, but when asked about where it came from, "they all said it originally was transmitted from the Central Land.'"[41] Among the achievements of antiquity

39 See W. T. Chan, "The Hsing-li Ching-i and the Ch'eng-Chu School of the seventeenth century," in W. T. deBary, ed., *Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism*, 546-548. The compilations are conveniently listed in Hou Wailu, *Song Ming lixue shi*, 1021.

40 "Shu li ben yuan數理本原," *Shu li jing yun*(1723 edition), la-b.

41 *Ibid.*, 10b.

that are cited as having been transmitted are the astronomical instruments--*xuan ji yu heng*--inspected by the sage Shun. Through these imperially sponsored compilations, the emperor was effectively endorsing the slogan, Western learning originated in China(*xi xue zhong yuan*西學中源).

The distinct turn away from new mathematics and astronomy had its ironies. In the years that the claim was popularized that the new mathematics and astronomy were rooted in Chinese antiquity, and in the River Diagram and Lo Writing, in particular, as the most ancient expressions of "number" and numerical relationships, Hu Wei胡渭(1633-1714), who had worked with Xu Qianxue in the 1690s, was proving their provenance was from not much before the Song dynasty and not from high antiquity. The emperor and his descendents may have given up on universally verifiable astronomy and mathematics, whether introduced by Jesuits or rediscovered from China's past. But as the emperor sought to establish himself as arbiter of Zhu Xi's learning based on coherence(*li*), that other major expression of what is universally so, the interpretation of *li* was moving more along the lines of "principles," rules inferred from and applied to the arena of human effort. In the eighteenth century, influential scholars following Gu Yanwu's lead put their intellectual effort into investigating the cultural tradition which they controlled.

Primary Sources

Fang Kongzhao 方孔炤, "Chongzhen lishu yue 崇禎曆書約," in *Zhou yi tuxiang ji biao* 周易圖象幾表(1660; Reprint Taibei: Wenjing, 1982).

Fang Zhongtong 方中通, *Shu du yan* 數度衍. Reprint *Siku quanshu*(Taibei: Shangwu, 1983), vol. 802.

Gu Yanwu 顧炎武, *Gu Tinglin shi wen ji* 顧亭林詩文集(Beijing: Zhonghua, 1959).

——, *Ri zhi lu ji shi* 日知錄集釋(Reprint Shanghai: Shangwu, 1927).

——, *Yuan chao ben Ri zhi lu* 原抄本日知錄(Taibei: Minglun, 1970).

Lu Shen 陸深, *Jintai ji wen* 金臺紀聞, in *Baibu Congshu jicheng* 百部叢書集成 (Reprint Taibei: Yiwen, nd).

Mei Wending 梅文鼎, *Fang cheng lun* 方程論, Reprint *Siku quanshu*(Taibei: Shangwu, 1983), vol. 495.

——, *Mei shi congshu jiyao* 梅氏叢書輯要(Reprint Taibei: Yiwen, 1971).

Shu li jing yun 數理精蘊(1723 imperial edition).

Da Qing Shengzu ren huangdi shi lu 大清聖祖仁皇帝實錄(Reprint Taibei: Hualian, 1964).

Wang Tingxiang 王廷相, *Wang Tingxiang ji* 王廷相集(Beijing: Xinhua, 1989).

Secondary Sources

Chan, Wing-tsit, "The Hsing-li ching-i and the Ch'eng-Chu School of the Seventeenth Century," in W. T. deBary, ed., *Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism*(New York: Columbia University Press, 1975), pp. 543-579.

Chu Ping-yi, "Technical Knowledge, Cultural Practices and Social Boundaries: Wan-nan Scholars and the Recasting of Jesuit Astronomy 1600-1800" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1994).

Engelfriet, Peter, *Euclid in China: The Genesis of the First Chinese Translation of Euclid's* Elements *Books I-VI(Jihe yuanben; Beijing 1607) and its Reception up to 1723*(Leiden: Brill, 1998).

Fung Kanwing(Feng Jinrong)馮錦榮, "Fang Zhongtong ji qi *Shu du yan* 方中通及其數度衍," *Lun heng* 論衡 2.1(1995), pp. 128-209.

——, "Mingmo Qingchu Fang shi xuepai zhi chengli ji qi zhuzhang 明末清初方氏學派之成立及其主張," *Kyōto daigaku jinbun kagaku kenkyūjō kenkyū hōkoku* 京都大學人文科學研究所研究報告. 1989, pp. 139-219.

Henderson, John, *Development and Decline of Chinese Cosmology*(New York: Columbia University Press, 1984).

——, "Ch'ing Scholars' Views of Western Astronomy," *HJAS* 46.1(1986), pp. 121-148.

Hou Wailu 侯外廬 et al., *Song Ming lixue shi* 宋明理學史(Beijing: Renmin, 1987).

Legge, James, trans., *The Chinese Classics*, 5 volumes(Reprint Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1960).

Li Di 李迪 and Guo Shirong 郭世榮, *Mei Wending* 梅文鼎(Shanghai: Shanghai kexue jishu, 1988).

Li Fusun 李富孫, *Hozheng qian lu* 鶴徵前錄, in *Zhao dai congshu* 昭代叢書(1833), *juan* 23.

Ming shi 明史(Reprint Beijing: Zhonghua, 1974).

Ren Daobin 任道斌, *Fang Yizhi nianpu* 方以智年譜(Hofei: Anhui jiaoyu, 1983).

Song Dexuan 宋德宣, *Kangxi sixiang yanjiu* 康熙思想研究(Beijing, 1990).

Struve, Lynn, "The Hsu Brothers and Semiofficial Patronage of Scholars in the K'ang-hsi Period," *HJAS* 42.1(1982), pp. 231-266.

Witek, John, ed., *Ferdinand Verbiest(1623-1688): Jesuit missionary, scientist, engineer and diplomat*(Nettetal: Steyler, 1994).

Zhang Mu 張穆, *Gu Tinglin nianpu* 顧亭林年譜(1844), Reprint in *Yueya tang congshu* 粵雅堂叢書, and also in *Nianpu congshu*(Taibei: Guangwen, 1971).

Zhang Yongtang 張永堂, *Mingmo Qingchu lixue yu kexue guanxi zai lun* 明末清初理學與科學關係再論(Taibei: Xuesheng, 1994).

清初士人的悔罪心態與消極行為

——不入城、不赴講會、不結社

王汎森

中央研究院歷史語言研究所研究員

探討明清思想文化時，我們大多將心力放在清代思想文化的興起，而忽略了明代文化的衰落，而其中最令人困惑的是兩個問題：第一，晚明文化中那種灑脫、侈放的風格，何以在清代慢慢就看不到了？第二，晚明心學家的講會、結社，何以在清代也慢慢不見了？在這篇文章中，我想試著對上述兩個問題略作解答，我想討論的是當時的一些消極性行爲，它們的特色是一系列的「不」。不過這裡必須先強調一點，以免引起讀者誤會，那就是這些「不」雖然多起於晚明，盛於改朝換代之後，但是這些「不」所指向的現象，並非驟然不見，而是經過數十年的時間，才漸漸消逝。

「不」的後面有一個非常遼闊的領域，但是人們卻選擇其中特定幾種，它們本身帶有對話性。消極性的行爲有兩種，一種是對舊的，一種是對新的。對舊朝的消極性行動，表現爲對晚明文人文化、講學文化的追悔與排斥，對新朝的消極行爲，則表現爲儘量切斷社會接觸，自我邊緣化，不進入新朝的政治空間，不與現實政權有實際的交涉。不過此處

要特別強調，在政治或社會上消極，在學術文化上並不一定消極，反而可能是非常積極，不能一概而論。本文分成三個部分，在第一部分中，我描述了當時很流行的一些負面性的「罪」、「愧」、「悔」、「棄」的意識。在第二部分中，我探討清初大量士人「不入城」、焚棄儒服、不入縣庭的事例，並說明明亡前的不入城與清初不入城意義上的不同。第三，我想談當時另一個特殊的現象，即不赴講會、不結社、一書不兩序、不收門徒。以上幾種現象，在時間上相互重疊，他們直接或間接地與三個問題有關，第一是不滿明代後期的文人文化，第二則是在不承認新朝的政治正當性的同時，還有拒斥明代城市文化的意思，第三是不滿明代後期的講學文化，而這三者都是明代後期士人文化的核心成分。所以上述現象的出現，一方面是舊文化菁英在政治文化活動上的自我邊緣化，一方面也代表著明代士人文化特質的逐漸消逝。

一、「罪」、「愧」、「悔」、「棄」的意識

首先要談的是明末清初士人「感情結構」(structure of feeling)的變化[1]。在清初的知識階層中，可以看到一種「感情結構」的變化，本文試著把握他們內心世界的變化，以便觀察他們與逝去的王朝的關係。這裡需要強調的是，在政權更迭之時，有許許多多的士人快快樂樂地追逐新朝功名，但也有一批遺民，他們因爲亡國而產生反省、追憶、悔恨、捨棄的意識，並對晚明學風進行反省與檢討。同時也探討政治的劇變如何導致明季士大夫生活態度的轉變，終至逐漸消失？同時士大夫生活方式也有所改變，由晚明的活潑、開放，慢慢轉變爲清代的平實。上述變

---

1 我使用這個名詞，當然是受到雷蒙・威廉思(Raymond Williams)的影響。威廉思認為，在研究過去時，最難把握的是一種貫串於生活世界的感情結構。一個世界的「感情結構」不是一致的，不過在居主導地位的群體中表現得特別明顯。Raymond Williams, *The Long Revolution*(London: Hogarth, 1961), pp.45-8.

化助長了清初官方所期望的一種馴服的、平庸的、四平八穩的理想士大夫形態，所以不期然地產生了一種符合異族政權的弔詭性結果。不過，必須強調，本文只是從一個層面去看這種深刻而複雜的變化。

當然，對不少人而言，明清易代不一定有地坼天崩之感。譬如《啓禎紀聞錄》卷三記載北都淪陷時吳江百姓的反應說：

> (甲申)四月初二日，吳江賽會，目睹者云富麗異常，為郡中從來所未有。是時北都不祥之說已競傳，民間猶為此舉，可見人無憂國之心[2]。

到了康熙二十三年九月聖駕南巡時，依當時住在上海的姚廷遴的日記(稿本)《歷年記》中記載，當皇帝到達蘇州虎丘時，一般百姓的情緒非常激昂興奮，亡國之痛似乎已經不存在了，人們忙著執香跪接聖駕，叩首稱「願我皇萬歲」，蘇州清官忙著獻藝，而皇帝也動手打鼓，讓這些熱情的百姓們聽聽滿洲人的音樂[3]。

---

2 葉紹袁，《啓禎紀聞錄》，《痛史》(上海：上海商務印書館，1913)第十三種，卷3，頁8。

3 「……至日中后，方起馬。撫院傳百姓：俱要執香跪接，候聖駕。上亦著頭等哈傳諭百姓：不論男女，盡他們看，不許攔趕，大小店肆，仍舊開張，不許掩閉。自此傳聞，百姓擁擠街道，聖駕過，百姓叩首俯伏曰：願我皇萬歲！上曰：你們百姓多有壽。婦女多在樓窗內擠看。駕出閶門，到山塘上，人擠難行，河內舡亦擠滿，上在馬上又傳旨曰：百姓不要跪。竟到虎丘……」「傳蘇州清客打十番，打完，上曰：好，果然好，但是只曉得南方的音，還不曉得我北方的音。叫小番來，打一番與你們看。即刻飛傳舡上小番來，俱十五、六歲俊俏童子……打一套十番，果然好絕。姑蘇極老班頭，亦從未聞見者。約有一個時辰方畢，時已黃昏矣。上起而出，到天主殿，見下邊百姓擁擠，塔上俱點紅燈，照耀滿山，看者不肯散去。上曰：上邊百姓都已聽見了，下邊的還沒有聽見，再打一套去。隨坐千人石上，打起十番。上自動手打鼓，后乃連打數套，逐件弄過，直打至二更時方完……」姚廷遴，《歷年記》，在《清代日記匯抄》(上海：上海人民出版社，1982)，頁120。姚氏日記按年敘述始於明崇禎元年迄至清康熙三十六年(1628－1697)，共七十年間親身所歷事。「姚氏生

百姓如此，士大夫中也不乏對這個變局無動於衷的[4]。儘管如此，我們仍不能忽略當時有許許多多人感受到天崩地解之痛。清季楊鳳苞(1757-1816)在歷覽晚明清初文獻之後，表示清初士人對舊國舊君的負疚之感是「大江以南無地無之」[5]。

這些憔悴失職的士人以各種方法表達其故國之思，有的繫明代銅錢於手上，有的把網巾畫在頭上，有的在身上刺字，以誓不忘「本朝」：在中央研究院歷史語言研究所的內閣大庫檔案中，有一件順治五年盛復選的題本，其中提到，在如皐發現有一位許元博「潛踞雙店，鼓惑鄉愚」，「及剝衣加刑，露出胸前刺不愧本朝肆字，左臂刺生爲明人，右臂刺死爲明鬼…。」[6] 也有人密書誓言于衣襟，曰「生爲明人，死爲明鬼」(陶琰)[7]；最值得注意的是當時士大夫對前明時期生活態度深刻追思與懺悔。

留心文體興衰之人，會發現清初「夢憶體」的興起。這時出現一批書，如《談往》[8]、《遺事瑣談》、《閒思往事》、《憶記》、《陶庵夢憶》[9] 等，都反映了當時的風氣。這種文體的特色是追思太平往事——「回想太平時序，兒女柔情，不覺銷魂久之」[10]。或是說：「但得身見太平，則爲人奴、爲乞丐，亦所甘心，迄今迴思，不禁兩淚交流」。

(續)

當明清易代之際，少作縣吏，老為鄉農，對當時宰官循酷，吏治興廢，年歲豐歉，物產盈虛，風俗變革等，所知較詳，記載特備」(以上見《清代日記匯抄》為《歷年記》所作介紹，頁39)。此條史料因余英時老師所示而得知。

4 如梁維樞，見謝國楨，《明清筆記談叢》(北京：中華書局，1962)，頁51。

5 「明社既屋，士之憔悴失職高蹈而能文者，相率結為詩社，以抒寫其舊國、舊君之感，大江以南無地無之……」楊鳳苞，〈書南山草堂遺集後〉，《秋室集》(湖州叢書本)，卷1，頁15-6。

6 張偉仁主編，《明清檔案》(台北：聯經出版公司，1986)，冊七，清順治五年一月(日不詳)之九，A7-102(2-1)。

7 武新立，《明清稀見史籍敘錄》(南京：金陵書畫社，1983)，頁240。

8 謝國楨，《晚明史籍考》(上海：上海古籍出版社，1981)，頁952。

9 以上見同前書，頁940、945、948。

10 孫靜庵，《明遺民錄》(杭州：浙江古籍出版社，1985)，頁80。

11或是像《陶庵夢憶》中的張岱(1597-？)，在迴思太平時節秦淮河房、虎丘盛集、吳中絕技、蘇州煙火、揚州瘦馬，甚至鬥雞社、噱社之類他所謂的「罪案」[12]時，感到不勝唏噓，然後說「今已矣，三十年來，杜門謝客，客亦漸辭老人去」[13]。

追思、夢憶之餘，便是深刻的悔恨，從個人的字號，社團的名稱，到齋館的名字，都充斥著「愧」、「慚」、「棄」、「慎」、「止」、「省」之類的消極性字眼[14]。張岱說他的《夢憶》是在「國破家亡，無所歸止」後，迴思平生，「種種罪案，從種種果報中見之」，故將過去五十年的種種，「持向佛前，一一懺悔」[15]。懺悔之餘，他們發展出一些新的生活態度。這些新態度的特色即否定前明時期士人的風習，以一系列的「不」爲其特色，如不赴夜宴、不入城市、不赴講會、不結社等。

除了一系列「不」之外，表現得最爲突出的便是反明代文人文化的心態。明代文人文化內容異常豐富，也異常多彩多姿，非此處所能盡述，此處只能舉與我們此下要討論有關的幾點。

首先當然是文人數量多、「山人」多、活動多，而且這些活動多帶有標榜應酬的特質。第二是文人好遊，東奔西跑。當時文人多以遊爲第二性命，幾乎是排日出遊，不時與朋友相約在遙遠的地方相會，遊了之後，還要回憶，遊的時候要畫舫笙歌，酒食爭逐，盡情地享受著商業社會及城市文化所帶來的樂趣。第三是文人文化中脫離儒家禮法的傾向。

---

11 《晚明史籍考》中〈湘上癡脫難實錄〉條，頁949。

12 以上見張岱，《陶庵夢憶》(上海：上海古籍出版社，1982)，頁9、27、30、50、58等。

13 同前書，〈序〉，頁1。

14 屠用錫輯，《六經堂遺事》(四明叢書本)，張壽鏞序云屠天生「甲申之變，結棄繻社」。丘維屏稱居所為「愧屋」，見謝正光、范金民編，《明遺民錄彙輯》(南京：南京大學出版社，1995)(以下簡稱《彙輯》)，頁112。

15 〈夢境序〉，《張岱詩文集》(上海：上海古籍出版社，1991)，頁110-1。

有幾個例子可以說明這個現象。首先是魏晉文士的任誕佻達爲許多文人所嚮往，許多書的編輯方式即自覺地模仿《世說新語》，像《何氏語林》、《舌華錄》、《玉劍尊聞》、《玉堂叢語》。此外，也有人每天選取世說中一則任誕的事蹟加以仿行 [如張獻翼(？-1604)]，甚至連禪僧也不避佻達[16]。人們爭相在行爲上求「新」、求「奇」，以求突出於文人社群，並獲得某種聲譽。此外，明代文化脫離儒家禮法的傾向，還表現在大膽批評古人〔如李贄(1527-1602)〕、或大膽懷疑古代的史事，或近乎輕率地看待自己與古代聖人的關係[17]。第四，明代心學家每好講學、結社，招收大量門徒。第五，明代士人甚爲驕橫，動輒干謁官府，或現身縣庭干預詞訟，甚至還有所謂「免糧銀」「叩散米」的怪現狀(——無錫諸生每歲有免糧銀，無田可免者，縣官還得給米，稱爲「扣散米」。)[18]

不過大約從晚明的最後二十年，文化界已經開始出現兩種明顯的分流，一方面是盡情享受明代文化的多元活潑或是腐敗墮落，另一方面是想竭力維持傳統文化理想中以農業社會爲主的生活形態，這兩種勢力互相爭持著，而我們所熟悉幾位清學的開山大師多是傾向於後者的。他們竭力批判明代文化風習。

這裡先舉顧炎武(1613-82)的批判性文字爲例。首先他痛斥整體的「文人」，反覆勸人不要流爲「文人」[19]，他的《日知錄》中有一些條目都是對晚明文人文化而發的，像「通鑑不載文人」，「文人之多」條即是。此外「古人不爲人立傳」、「文不貴多」、「誌狀不妄作」、「古人集中無冗複」[20]，都是針對當時文人的寫作習慣而發。

---

16 《萬曆野獲編》(北京：中華書局，1959)，頁693。

17 如劉聲木《萇楚齋隨筆》(北京：中華書局，1998)中說明代胡震亨《讀書雜記》嘲弄古帝，馮渠撰《進修錄》，全倣《論語》。

18 計六奇，《明季北略》(北京：中華書局，1984)，頁337。

19 《顧亭林詩文集》(北京：中華書局，1959)，頁96。

20 《原抄本日知錄》(台北：唯一書業中心，1975)，頁21-22。

晚明文人的生活品味，如「辨書畫，識金石奇器，焚香掃地，與名僧聯床對語」[21]，如講究園冶[22]，如西湖冶遊，不一而足。在改朝換代之後，這種生活形態逐漸產生改變。

文人賞玩珍奇的風氣也漸消褪，即使連觴政中「置酒」、「杯杓」、「飲儲」等方面也有從晚明「去樸從豔」、「好新慕異」的時尚，變爲由奢入俗，去華從樸的趨向。清代文人改正前人脫略的習氣，更重細節，愈切實際，也更符合禮教[23]。

又如西湖的文士活動，本是明季文人學者最重要的一章。如我們讀陳寅恪《柳如是別傳》第四章汪然明尺牘中談及西湖遊湖之變化，即可看出兩代之間的易動。在明季，西湖是「虎林王謝子弟多好夜遊看花，選妓徵歌，集于六橋，一樹桃花一角燈，風來生動，如燭龍欲飛，較秦淮五日燈船，尤爲曠麗」[24]，但是，改朝換代以後，西湖蕭索，「晝遊者尙多蝟縮，欲不早歸不得矣。」[25] 陳寅恪先生對此現象的解釋是，清兵入關駐防杭州，西湖變成戎馬之區所致，我以爲除此之外，與文人學者蕭索慚愧的心態也不無關係。同治年間伍紹棠跋《長物志》時有這樣一段觀察：

> 有明中葉，天下承平，士大夫以儒雅相尚，若評書品畫，瀹茗焚香，彈琴選石等事，無一不精，而當時騷人墨客，亦皆工鑒別，善品題，玉敦珠盤，輝映壇坫，若啓美此書，亦庶幾卓卓

21 〈陸文虎先生墓誌銘〉，《黃宗羲全集》(杭州：浙江古籍出版社，1985-1994) 冊十，頁340。

22 陳植，〈明末文震亨氏的造園學說〉，在《長物志校注》(江蘇：江蘇科學技術出版社，1984)，頁429-40。

23 王次澄，〈明清文人觴政——會飲的禮儀與規範〉，《漢學研究》10：1(1992)，頁291-2。

24 《柳如是別傳》(台北：里仁書局，1981)，頁377-8。

25 同前書，頁378。

> 可傳者。蓋貴介風流，雅人深致，均于此見之。曾幾何時，而國變滄桑，向所謂「玉躞金題」，「奇花異卉」者，僅足供楚人一炬[26]。

我覺得對照明末與清初的文獻，伍氏這段跋文很能將文人生活品味上的變化凸顯出來。文人社會由明季的喧囂浮動靜了下來，士風也由囂張而沉寂。從一個人前後之變化可以看出這個趨勢，整個文人社群的變化亦復如此。這一類變化非常廣，也非常深微，涉及生活的許多方面，不是這篇文章所能盡舉的。

二、焚棄儒服、不入縣庭、捨棄家庭

這一代士大夫在面臨地坼山崩之局時，有一些高度象徵性的活動[27]。儒家士大夫原有一套象徵系統，平時是士大夫生活中不自覺的一部分，但到了改朝換代之時，士人便以這些象徵性動作表達內心世界最強烈的感受。筆、硯、儒服、儒籍與文廟居有核心地位。

首先是毀棄文具或文稿。焚燬文稿可以有許多意涵，最簡單的解釋是不滿過去的作品，或是害怕在新朝得禍，不過，它也可以是一個士人徹底放棄功令追求的表示。呂留良(1629-83)的一篇〈櫟園焚餘序〉隱微地表達了這一層意思。呂氏列舉了古往今來文人自焚其稿的種種理由，發現它們與櫟園主人周亮工(1612-72)於康熙九年自焚文稿的理由都不符合，他說周氏「其書又不觸忌諱，不墮魔外，屬屬焉以古之作者爲歸，然則櫟園之所以焚，又必有不同於古人者。」他說作者原負天下之名，望者以爲神仙，「忽焉天地震盪，劫灰晝飛，猿鶴蟲沙，蒼黃類

---

26 同前書，頁423。

27 其中如哭廟、焚儒服，請參閱陳國棟，〈哭廟與焚儒服——明末清初生員層的社會性活動〉，《新史學》3：1，頁69-94。

化，浪平痛定，一時同學廑有存者，宇內屈指，櫟園巋然其一也，……迺天下方乞膏馥于櫟園，櫟園且取而煨燼之，何歟？兔園糞溲，重自珍戀，猶什襲緗藉，況著作如櫟園，非有所大不堪於中而然歟？余是以惜其書，不如悲其志也，豪士壯年，抱奇抗俗，其氣方極盛，視天下事無不可為，……及日暮塗歧，出狂濤險穴之餘，精銷實落，回顧壯心，汔無一展，有不如腐儒村牖之俯仰自得者。吐之難為聲，茹之難為情，……彼方思早焚其身之為快，而況於詩文乎哉？」[28]從這一段文字可以看出周氏焚稿是表達一種完全自我放棄的心情。呂留良在明亡時才十幾歲，他的經驗與櫟園主人不同，不過，他還是相當能掌握這種一切斷絕無望的心情。在當時焚稿、焚筆、焚硯的例子相當不少[29]。

還有焚棄儒服與呈削儒籍。一個人的衣服代表一個人的心靈狀態，宋亡時已不乏焚、棄儒服的例子，明代生員在地方上有著重要的地位，生員可以領廩米，故代表生員以上地位的儒服便格外有意義，褫革衣衿，是對生員具有重大義意的懲罰[30]。儒冠是另一個衝突點，我們可以看到許許多多焚冠的記載。《離憂集》卷上收了文介石的一首〈焚冠〉：

> 紗帽風霜歷幾時，莊嚴當日漢官儀，一朝倒置誰知惜，幾處歎彈我自悲，懶挂東都同俗變，化為清氣與雲隨，從茲歷歷沖霄去，塗炭休教得浼之[31]。

---

28 《呂晚村文集》（台北：商務印書館，1977），卷5，頁10-1。

29 此處列幾條相關資料以證焚硯、焚稿舉動之不乏見

方授	甲申焚筆硯。（《明遺民錄》，頁230。）
李魁春	生平纂述甚富，國變后，委諸爐。（同前書，頁32。）
呂章成	病中自毀其著述。（同前書，頁340-2。）
張蓋	恆自毀其稿。（同前書，頁316。）

30 呈請削儒籍的材料如陳確〈呈學請削籍詞〉，《陳確集》（北京：中華書局，1979），頁68。

31 陳瑚輯，《離憂集》（崑山趙氏峭帆樓校刻本），頁3-4。

穿白衣冠或其他衣冠的人不少，不管他們衣冠的顏色爲何，都表示不穿清朝服制的意思[32]。焚棄儒服與呈請削儒籍一樣，表示斷絕追求現實功名的意念。我們應該還能記得明季華亭陳繼儒(1558-1639)年未三十，取儒衣冠焚棄之，與徐益孫結隱于小崑山的故事[33]。陳繼儒三十歲時正是明神宗萬曆十八年(1590)，離明亡還有五、六十年，他的例子告訴我們焚棄儒服代表著決心放棄對國家功令的追求、跳脫世俗規範去過自由自在的生活。不過，陳繼儒的焚儒服帶有文人自我標榜的性質。三一教的創始人林兆恩(1517-98)則在屢次應試失敗後焚儒服，而開始他別具一格的宗教活動。對他們而言，這一襲衣服的意義是無比重大的。焚棄衣冠有時也代表不欲與聞天下國事之事[34]，即使朝廷詔起也不理會。明亡之後，放棄儒衣儒冠或將它們還返文廟的例子不少，它們也表示了一

32 如李騰蛟「三十年未嘗著時服」(《彙輯》，頁319)，如吳志閑「屏居教授，素冠麻衣」(同前書，頁215)，如汪文錫「鼎革後，高帽深衣」(同前書，頁335)。至於傅山，也有人認為他是穿著白衣冠的。關於傅山的白衣冠，陳去病有所辨證。他說「予聞之予友無畏，傅先生居恆，每著白衣冠，或游行都市，眾指目之，不為怪也。而全謝山謂其服乃朱衣黃冠，何耶？豈白衣冠為國喪後二十年服，而朱衣黃冠則被舉鴻博時所服歟？抑白衣冠處其常，而朱衣黃冠處其變歟？」(同前書，頁802)。此外，「國號」與「錢幣」也是兩個重要爭執點，如王鳳岡「告身不書清號」(同前書，頁104)，如林古度，臂間總是掛一枚明代的銅錢〔張慧劍，《明清江蘇文人年表》(上海：上海古籍出版社，1986)，頁719〕，如王錫闡「不用時世一錢」(《彙輯》，頁104)，如《從游集》卷上所收顧湄的〈詠舊錢〉：「看囊羞澀一錢深，十載相違隔古今，磨滅形神猶剩字，周遭輪郭只虛心，方圓尚與乾坤合，興廢寧知歷數侵，白水望遙應有讖，五銖重見蜀中吟。」(陳瑚輯，《從游集》(崑山趙氏峭帆樓校刻本)卷上，頁7。)

33 錢謙益，《列朝詩集小傳》(上海：上海古籍出版社，1983)，頁637。

34 祝開美當京師潰敗時，開美南歸。後聞留京諸重臣迎福王子而立之，是為弘光。弘光帝召劉宗周，劉氏未起，上疏言開美因建言獲罪，希望朝廷詔復為舉人。次年，兵部請授開美台諫之職，上不許。然而當時祝開美已經焚棄衣冠，表示自已不欲見聞天下事了。見柴紹炳，〈祝孝廉先生淵傳〉，在《清代碑傳全集》(上海：上海古籍出版社，1987)，卷123，頁615。關於儒服在歷史的地位，可參考康有為，《孔子改制考》(台北：商務印書館，1968)，卷21，頁11-2的材料。

種決心，不再追求現實的功名，同時還添加了一層新的意義，即不承認這個新政權，不再與聞新朝政治，在新的朝代裡自我邊緣化[35]。

此外，更爲激烈的象徵性活動是不在新朝打官司，以免與現實政權接觸。全祖望(1705-55)《結埼亭集》裡說周之璿(敬可)：

> 事定歸家，則田宅盡為人所奪，遂無一廛，或勸訟諸官，敬可曰，吾不忠不孝，投死他鄉，何顏復搆獄於官府，與惡少共對簿，遂寄食於貞孝家以死[36]。

周之璿不願訴於官府，或有現實的考慮，因爲周氏曾經參加義師，侵佔他田宅的人可以用這一點來反控他，爲免投鼠忌器，還是不與官府交接爲佳，而且在官府訴訟，勢必得穿清朝的服裝，這未必是他所願意的。另一個例子是張履祥(1611-74)。張氏不曾有任何抗清的行動，所以不必畏懼訴官會引來反噬，但是他的女兒被地方惡霸毒死，他竟也不願告訴於官府，而是發布告直接訴諸於人民[37]。

---

35 譬如朱用純　1645年，朱用純父卒，用純以遺命，棄儒冠，授徒贍母。(錢謙益，《列朝詩集小傳》，頁637。)

李寄之　棄巾服。(《黃宗羲全集》，冊十，頁297。)

邢昉　棄諸生服。(《張楊園先生集》(清同治十年江蘇書局刊本)，卷31，頁21。)

李生光　甲申之變，北向痛哭，焚其青衿。(《張楊園先生集》，卷31，頁10。)

陳所學　明亡，手裂諸生巾。[《朱柏廬編年毋欺錄》中所記，轉引自麥仲貴，《明清儒學家著述生卒年表》(台北：學生書局，1977)，頁295。]

王隼　遺民王邦畿之子，徐世昌《晚晴簃詩匯詩話》說他「隱居不出，嘗入丹霞為僧，遊匡廬，居太乙峰，冬，返儒服卒。」

36 全祖望，〈子劉子祠堂配享碑〉，在《結埼亭集》(台北：華世出版社，1977)，卷24，頁300。

37 衷爾鉅，《蕺山學派哲學思想》(濟南：山東教育出版社，1993)，頁229。此外，還有一些高度禮儀性的安排。以衣冠為例：代表明代衣冠服制特色的網巾

此外，還有許多強烈捨離家庭與社會生活的例子。不少人拋棄家庭遠遊，有些是怕被舉發曾經參與抗清，但也有人是被一種懺悔、罪惡的意識所驅動；離家流浪成爲一種具有懺悔意味的苦行。譬如萬壽祺(1603-52)棄家爲僧，往來淮河南北，饑寒交迫而不願回家。他的兒子前來請求，萬氏仍然不允，他說：「吾家世受明恩，國亡，吾安忍獨享田園飫膏粱哉？」[38] 山東東萊的趙士喆，在明亡之後，住在離家五百里的山中，終身不再回家[39]。如劉永錫(？-1654)，在明亡之後四處搬

(續)

成為各種衝突與緊張的交會點。明亡之後，有幾篇畫網巾的故事，寫一個人被押之後，網巾被沒收，這位不知姓名的先生要他的兩個僕人為他畫網巾於額上，他的理由是「網巾則我太祖高皇帝創為之也」。〔〈畫網巾先生傳〉，《戴名世集》(北京：中華書局，1986)，頁169-170。〕「網巾」之所以成為一件富有高度象徵意義的物品並不是偶然的。髮制的不同，本來就是種族之間的重要差異，清初實行薙髮令之後，明代的網巾當然派不上用場，不願剃髮的人只好戴著帽子遮掩。所以有一則故事說，一群小孩追著一個遺民後面叫嚷「破帽換糖」時，弄得那位遺民窘迫萬狀，怕破帽摘下來後會露出網巾及額髮。關於這方面，最生動有趣的文獻應該是安徽貴池劉廷鑾的〈十二衰詩〉了，衰哪十二種東西呢？「曰網巾，曰方巾，曰儒巾，曰簪，曰紗帽，曰襴衫，曰條，曰長衫，曰官服，曰裙，曰網圈，曰網繩。」(《彙輯》，頁1020)這十二種東西都是明代士人的衣飾，劉氏當然是以悲愴的心情在寫這首詩，哀悼十二件最能代表明代士人身分的衣飾。因為平時看不到網巾了，所以有人便把高麗貢使進入北京時的服飾當作一件了不得的大事：「獨高麗使者至，則裹網巾，著紗帽，朱袍方袖束帶坐，長上入朝。都人嘆息，以為漢官盛儀。」(同前書，頁1190。)也有不少人選擇不再進入代表現實政權的政治空間。晚明紳縉橫行，包攬詞訟，干預官府的風氣極盛，不過我們也看到一些零星的記載稱讚某些人不輕入縣庭。他們的舉動代表一種對士紳風氣的反省與不滿。在明代只是零星出現的例子，到了清初卻相當之多。譬如凌雲，他是廣東韶州仁化人，天啓丁卯舉人，崇禎庚辰會試進士，授河南府推官，國亡之後，他「足不入官府」(《彙輯》，頁702)。廣東新會的梁奇顯，天啓丁卯舉人，《勝朝粵東遺民錄》說他在國變之後，「足跡不涉公庭，見者不知其曾為(明)官也。」(《彙輯》，頁695)。廣東西寧的梁偉棟，崇禎壬午年薦明經，國變之後「終身未嘗謁長吏之庭」(《彙輯》，頁697)。廣東文昌的陳是集，也是「剌不入公庭」(《彙輯》，頁758)。廣東順德歐主遇也一樣是「絕跡公門」(《彙輯》，頁1024)。

38 《彙輯》，頁939。

39 同前書，頁990。

遷，就是不肯回老家[40]。江寧謝璣，在亡國後盡棄田宅，避入寧陽山中十餘年，髮落頂禿才回鄉[41]。

更爲徹底地捨離社會的方式是不與人交談或不與人交往，如成勇「十五年不與時人語」[42]，如安璜「屏居不交人」[43]，如王道增「不復與于交際之事」[44]。至於足不出戶，或幾十年不下樓的例子也不少[45]。不下樓通常是表示不願碰觸新朝的土地。

對故朝的懷想也表現在死亡儀式的安排上。活著的時候不能有抗議性行爲，死亡時總可以作種種安排吧。死亡儀式的安排反映一種內在的意識。他們通常要求後人不要用棺材，直接用幅巾布袍裹屍入土，或乾脆燒掉[46]。也有不少人要求家人以劣質的木棺來斂他們[47]。也有人要求在墓碑背面刻字[48]。也有人遺命「毋棺，毋受弔，毋刑牲，毋封，毋樹」[49]。這些消極性的行爲反映了這群人的內心的痛悔。

---

40 同前書，頁1016。

41 同前書，頁1140。有不少人是在外浪遊多年後直到暮年才又回歸故里的，如同前書，頁44、139、821。

42 同前書，頁245-6。

43 同前書，頁127。

44 同前書，頁97。

45 同前書，頁176。

46 如何弘仁死前說：「吾有志不就，忝厥所生，不忠不孝，我死後，不得棺斂，野暴三日，舉火焚之。」同前書，頁169。

47 如林時對　「遺命柳棺布衣」。（同前書，頁409。）
　姜埰　「遺命碑碣神主不題故官，棺用薄材。」（同前書，頁455。）
　嘉興錢士升　「歿而以幅巾道衣斂，遵遺命也。」（同前書，頁1107。）
　丹徒錢邦芑　「臨卒謂其徒曰：我明大臣也，愼無以僧禮葬我，可以幅巾方袍裹屍入土。」（同前書，頁1112。）
　寧郡魏兆鳳　「嘗自置惡棺，誡諸子曰：我死以此殮。諸子逡巡，兆鳳曰：先帝后視此何如？我死，毋帛衣，毋書旌，毋受弔。」（同前書，頁1194。）

48 如王俊業要求後人在墓碑的背面刻上「明人王世業」的字樣。同前書，頁92。

49 同前書，頁1218。

三、不入城

接著，我要談「不入城」的現象。

發誓不到某地或不過某地通常表達一種強烈的決心，不入城市是這一類「不」中最常見的一種。一直到民國時代，有人在日本佔領區誓不入城市[50]，也有人在國共政權更迭、天下離亂之際決意不入某些城市[51]，但這些都不如明末及清初士大夫不入城市的事例多。大抵而言，明亡以前不入城的事例以文化理由居多，而清初不入城之事例，則在文化理由之外，添加了一層新的政治理由。

如果我們用中研院史語所的二十五史資料庫去查，整部《宋史》中只有一個關於不入城的記載，而整部《元史》中根本不見這種記載。在《明史》中我們確實見到幾個不入城的事例，它們都與躲避城市的煩囂、以便專心求學，或是為了躲避城市中商業化的生活形態。當時城市文化的滲透力量雖然不像後來那樣大，不過，如果城市不是一個亂人心目的地方，或是一個提供許多機會讓人與現實糾纏的社會空間，則當時人似乎不必刻意以不入城市作為一種特殊的生活態度了[52]。

---

50 柳詒徵《劬堂題跋》(台北：華世書局，1996)，頁103〈蔡嵩雲竹西塢唱詞序〉上說蔡氏「寇焰熾時，遁跡竹西江村，偶攖其鋒，幾罹不測，憎寇甚，誓不入城市，欲他往，非得寇酋簽字之通行證不克，且必印其指模于證，念是即降敵，義不可，蟄處窮僻，爰未越雷池一步。」

51 錢穆《師友雜憶》(台北：東大圖書公司，1983)頁289-90記他於民國三十五年避居蘇州，以免捲入時代紛亂之局，「因此自戒，此下暫時絕不赴京滬平津四處各學校，而擇一偏遠地，猶得閉門埋首溫其素習，以靜待國事之漸定。」

52 《宋史》中僅見一次的不入城事例，是李迪的從子李肅之，他內行謹飭，母喪，廬墓三年，「不入城廓」。(《宋史》卷310，列傳第69。)明代中晚期，則出現一些因為受政治迫害而不入城市之例。劉瑾當國時因不滿其同鄉雍泰不與通好，所以當雍泰擢升南京戶部尚書時，才到任四天，就被劉瑾勒令致仕，連舉薦雍泰的官員們都受到重罰，雍泰歸鄉後「不入城市。瑾誅，復官」。(《明史》卷186，列傳74。)江陰的貢安甫也是遭劉瑾列名「奸黨」之首而

理學與城市似乎有一種緊張的關係，《明史》中最早出現的一個不入城的例子是章懋(楓山，1437-1522)，《明儒學案》中有他的傳記。《明史》中則相當清楚地說明他決心不入城是爲了專心學問的始末[53]。《明史》中還說有一位大官(曹璘)在廣東新會訪問理學大師陳獻章(1428-1500)之後，因爲嘆服他的學說，遂決定退休，在山中讀書，三十年不入城市[54]。另一位理學名儒羅欽順(1465-1547)也是里居二十餘年，「足不入城市」，潛心於格物致知之學，他與王守仁那次有關「格物」的歷史性論辯，便發生在「足不入城市」的時期[55]。晚明心學大儒羅汝芳(1515-1588)也有爲了專心講學，而一年不入城市的記錄[56]。對理學家而言，城市是各種流動的社會力量匯集的空間，它們與理學家所提倡的生活習性互相衝突。這裡應當先做一點說明，明代理學家中有許多流派，對城市生活的態度也有所不同，但其中是有一些人認爲一個理想的講學者應儘可能不要活動，不要出門，不要與人多見面，多言語，以免在言行有過差而妨礙修道。李二曲(1627-1705)的一段話說明了這種態度：「每日除萬不容已者，只得勉應，其餘苟非緊急大事，斷勿出門一步，終日不見人，則神自清，品自重，……不可輕履市肆，不可出入公門。」[57]在他們看來，不入城市是潛心修道的一個重要的前提[58]。

(續)

「家居十年，終歲不入城市」。(《明史》卷188，列傳76。)後來張居正當國時，朱鴻謨也因被張居正所迫害，歸而「杜門講學，不入城市」，張居正死後，才又起復原官，再入城市。(《明史》卷227，列傳115。)以上這幾個不入城市的例子都與逃避政治迫害有關。

53 《明史》中有這樣一段話談到他屏跡不入城府：「既歸，屏跡不入城府，奉親之暇，專以讀書講學為事，弟子執經者日益進，貧無供具，惟脫粟菜羹而已，四方學士大夫高其風，稱為楓山先生，家居二十餘年，中外交薦，部檄屢起之，以親老堅不赴。」《明史》卷179，列傳67。

54 《明史》卷180，列傳68。

55 《明史》卷282，列傳170。

56 《盱壇直詮》上記他乙卯建從姑山房以待四方遊學之士，日與諸友講講，「足不入城市」。《盱壇直詮》(台北：廣文書局，1997)，頁222。

57 李顒，《二曲集》(北京：中華書局，1996)，頁117。錢謙益《列朝詩集小

前面所舉的都是理學家。除了他們之外，士人中還有一些不入城市的例子，有的是因爲自己曾經忤逆當道[59]，有的是怕見到官[60]，有的是厭棄科舉[61]，有的是在放棄諸生資格之後刻意逃世[62]，有的是耽圖安閒

(續)

傳》上說徐璘「踰年一入市城，寄浮屠舍，蕭然旅人。」(頁417)徐𤊹寫到林宗大時說：「友人林宗大，字時中，邑諸生也，屏居村落，不入城市。」《徐氏筆精》(台北：學生書局，1971)，卷4，頁47。

58 拒斥城市文化仍是近代思想中的一個主題。近代中國未再見到有一群人誓不入城，即使在清遺民中似乎也不例外，這可能因為現代人比古人更不能完全離開城市而生存。不過許多知識份子筆下的城市仍然是非常負面的地方，五四時期，李大釗在民國八年的〈青年與農村〉一文中說：「都市有許多罪惡，鄉村裡有許多幸福，都市上的生活，幾乎都是鬼的生活，鄉村中的生活，全是人的生活。」陳獨秀、傅斯年等人，也不約而同地譴責上海，認為這個城市應該來一次洪水。這番言論除了反映了當時北京士人與海派文人深刻的對立外，也某種程度反映了對現代城市之敵視。但他們畢竟只舉出一個上海作箭靶。至於梁漱溟，則根本認為中華文化復興的希望不在已經洋化、道德精神喪失的城市，而在鄉村。(許紀霖，〈梁漱溟與儒家的內聖外王理念〉，《學術集林》卷二，頁246)，他有種種「鄉村建設」的努力，從未想過都市革新，而鄉村建設之呼聲頗為普遍，卻從未有城市革新之口號。熊十力的《十力語要》(台北：洪氏出版社，1975)中更斥城市為墮落之深淵。(頁35)值得注意的是，也有不少教門人物為了潛心修道，數十年不入城市，如《金蓋心鐙》卷一〈第四代周大拙律師傳〉記當時玄門零落：「有志之士皆全身避咎，師隱青城，不履塵市五十餘年。」《金蓋心鐙》，在《藏外道書》(成都：巴蜀書社，1992)，卷一，頁5。

59 金壇張祥鳶，他是嘉靖己未進士，曾為戶曹郎十餘年，後來出為雲南知府，因為迕逆當道而告歸，此後，他「讀書賦詩，足跡不入城市」。《列朝詩集小傳》，頁402。

60 明代古文大家茅坤老年所寫的〈七戒齋記〉中的第五戒便是「不入城郭」，理由是「城郭者，藩臬郡縣及按節使所乘軒擁傳處，而予年八十則不能以筋骨為禮……」引自杜聯喆，《明人自傳文鈔》(台北：藝文印書館，1971)，頁174。

61 錢唐周大續，年十二為諸生，他在萬曆丙辰年突有感慨，謝舉子業，結廬父墓，幅巾革履四十八年，「終不入城市」。《彙輯》，頁373。

62 《郭西小志》記陳陵：「(陳)椒堂名陵，字小山，餘姚馬渚人。十五補紹興庠生，隨父梅川粟遷居杭之永昌　。……五十后棄諸生，築圃于嶺上(案：杭州城外鐵冶嶺)，蓄書萬卷，坐臥其中，不入城市幾三十年。子孟起，字春生，極盡孝養，崇禎壬午、癸未間，流寇之禍漸通東南，喟然謂子曰：『吾明諸生也。時事不可知，要當終于明耳。』甲申正月十三，無疾而逝，壽七十有九。逾兩月，懷宗崩而國亡，陵果終于明代云。」引自丁丙，《武林坊巷志》(杭州：浙江人民出版社，1986)，冊二，頁80。

的生活[63]。

但是更多的不入城是農業社會中堅持農村素樸文化理想的人反城市文化的心態。

在明代中晚期城市文化大盛之時，有些人認爲不入城可以守住農村素樸式生活方式，入城則不可避免地要深深浸潤在城市的商業化生活中。他們認爲當時社會風俗大變，城市中的奢靡之風甚熾，易於使人陷溺，所以有人遂以是否常入城市作爲志行清濁之分界，康熙《徽州府志》卷二〈風俗〉中趙吉士(1628-1706)說：「吾聞之先大父曰：『嘉隆之世，人有終其身未入城郭者，……有少與外事者，父兄羞之，鄉黨不齒焉。』今則武斷者比比矣，而閉戶不出者即群而笑之……」[64]嘉靖、隆慶年間正是許多人認爲社會風氣由樸轉奢之時代。城市文化大興，對正統派士人而言，嚴重地動搖了傳統中國尙樸尙儉、基本上以農村文化爲主的文化基調，引起許多人的恐慌，認爲它會破壞醇厚善良的舊俗[65]，而是否常入城市，便常被視爲一個人志行之純與濁的重大分野了[66]。

另外有一批文人，當他們表達對鄉居生活之緬懷，對城居生活的排

63 康熙《錢塘縣志・文苑傳》記張瀚的四世孫張芬時說：「晚耽棲逸，愛西溪衡山之勝，時握書一卷，吟哦其中，立石拒門，偽荆為户，危冠大帶，不入城市。兵燹後，盡亡其書。」轉引自朱倓，〈明季杭州讀書社考〉，《國學季刊》2：2(1929)，頁275。

64 丁廷楗修，趙吉士纂，《徽州府志》(清康熙三十八年刊本)卷二，頁73。

65 謝國楨，《明清社會經濟史料纂輯》(福州：福建人民出版社，1981)下冊，第九章。

66 城市代表一種消耗性的、不務本的生活，與以農為本的勤奮的理想相違背。清初張英《恆產瑣言》中記：「人家富貴兩字，暫時之榮寵耳，所恃以長子孫者，畢竟是耕讀兩字，子弟有二、三千金之產，方能城居，……若千金以下之業，則斷不宜城居矣。何則？居鄉則可以課耕數畝，其租倍入，可以供八口，……果其讀書有成，策名仕宦，可以城居，則再入城居一、二世，而後宜於鄉居，則再往鄉居，鄉城耕讀相為循環，可久可大。」〔張英，《恆產瑣言》(昭代叢書本)，頁11-2。〕張英提倡一種「城鄉耕讀相為循環論」，認為因為住城市只有消耗，所以要家裏有二、三千金的財產，才可以居住，否則應該居於鄉村，等到讀書有成，成為官宦，才入城居住一兩代，然後又搬回鄉間。

斥，帶有一點自我標榜式虛僞的文人告白的成分。譬如陳繼儒錄《小窗幽記》說：

山棲是勝事，稍一縈戀，則亦市朝[67]。

車塵馬足之下，露出醜行，深山窮谷之中，剩些眞影[68]。

陳繼儒所錄《小窗幽記》認爲山居有「八德」，反過來說，這八種益處也就是城市中所不可避免的糾纏：

山居勝於城市，蓋有八德：不責苛禮，不見生客，不混酒肉，不競田產，不聞炎涼，不鬧曲直，不徵文逋，不談士籍[69]。

陳繼儒代表的是文士對城市既喜歡、又躲避的態度，明亡之後，「反城市文化」的心態不但比以前突出，而且虛僞的文人告白的成分近乎消失了。陸桴亭(1611-1672)在一封信中不無歉然地說自己：

弟是以跡雖溷處城市，而此學此道，造次顚沛，未嘗敢忘[70]。

此處用「溷處」二字，相當鄙夷自已城居這件事。顧炎武說：

城市云為，終是徇人之學[71]。

67 陳眉公，《小窗幽記》(台北：文津出版社，1985)，頁9。
68 同前書，頁123。
69 陳眉公，《小窗幽記》，頁66。
70 凌錫祺，《桴亭年譜》，在《陸桴亭先生遺書》(清光緒二十五年刊本)，頁20。
71 〈答原一公肅兩甥書〉，《顧亭林詩文集》，頁57。

他在《日知錄》卷12〈人聚〉條上還說：

> 予少時見山野之氓有白首不見官長，安于畎畝，不至城中者，……已而山有負隅，林多伏莽，遂捨其田野，徙於城郭……人聚於鄉而治，聚於城而亂[72]。

顏元(1635-1704)在〈未墜集序〉中則自悔年少時之輕薄不檢，而在他自己看來，原因之一竟是因爲少年時生長於城市之故：

> 予世之罪戾人也，少長城市，輕薄不檢[73]。

顏氏在另一個場合中又說：

> 兼之生長城市，習染穢惡，洗滌其故著，求進於純正，甚難[74]。

口氣之間好像城市就是一個習染污穢的地方。

以上這些人多是對清代學術文化發展方向影響最大的儒者，他們所極口指斥的正是今天史學家所豔稱的明代的市民文化。從以上引文中可以看出，這些文化菁英理想中的生活方式是農業社會的，鄉村是治道之所存，而與晚明城市文化之間有極大的衝突。他們認爲農業社會中純樸的生活與穩定、秩序才是應該追求的，「市道」是邪惡敗壞的象徵。牟復禮(Frederich Mote)先生主張中國的城市與鄉村是處於連

---

72 《原抄本日知錄》，頁375。

73 《顏元集》(北京：中華書局，1987)，頁397。

74 同前書，頁437。

續狀態[75]，如果他的論點可從，那麼這些清學的開山刻意將農村與城市截然分開，便是一種有意識地切割社會空間的作法。

清初不入城的士人數目激增，而且大多是從政治的角度出發而決定不入城，他們所不入的「城」，基本上指縣城與郡城。

不入城並不等於隱居，隱士文化是中國文化傳統中的一部分。一個人因爲生活或自然習性而幾十年不入城，也與本文所討論的不同。本文所討論的是一種自發的、誓願式的(voluntarily)不入城。當時文獻中提到「不入城」時，其口氣和字眼與提到隱居不同。人們在綜觀他們一生時，通常也很清楚地強調他們不入城市或不履城市。

不入城自然是各種斷絕社會生活的方式之一。斷絕、捨棄、拒絕社會化的行爲，像一個光譜般，有濃淡遠近之不同。比較緩和的是埋光韜采，是屏跡郊野，是不輕入城[76]。比較激烈的是有意識地切斷與日常世界的所有聯繫。是「居土室，不通戶，一竇以傳飲食數年」，直到有一天突然排壁而出、去了靈巖山的烏程華[77]。是鼎革之後回到故鄉築「陶庵」「不與世人相接」的戴黃門[78]。是建一座小樓，坐臥其間者三十六年的錢喜起(1597？-1680？)[79]，是坐臥不下樓的應撝謙(1619-87)[80]。介於埋光韜采與截然切斷所有社會生活之間的，是自誓不入城市。當時

---

75 F. W. Mote, "The Transformation of Nanking, 1350-1400," in William Skinner, ed., *The City in Late Imperial China*(Standford: Standford University Press, 1977), p.103. 除了上述之外，明亡之前，還有些不入縣庭的例子，他們是出於對文人文化的不滿。在明代紳衿驕橫，動輒赴公庭干預事務的風氣之下，「不入縣庭」或「不以一札入公門」表示一種態度，即士人要本本分分地，不能到處活動關說。譬如錢謙益《列朝詩集小傳》記張名由「讀書談道，足跡不至縣庭。」(頁512)記許穀時，說他「岩居三十年，不通一字於政府。」(頁455)

76 《關學編》(北京：中華書局，1987)頁72記馮從吾：「林居凡二十年，自非會講，則不輕入城市。至於牘干公府，則一字不屑也。」

77 《彙輯》，頁956。

78 同前書，頁1169。

79 同前書，頁1114。

80 同前書，頁1129。

人顯然已留意到有一大群人有這種誓願性的行爲。在清初還有人爲不入城寫成專論，如劉若宜的〈不入城說〉即是[81]。也有人以不入城市的事蹟入詩，如陳維崧(1631-88)，他的朋友謝遴在改朝換代後二十年不入城，陳維崧贈他的詩中便說：

> 半畝牛宮繞菜田，鋤畦汲水獨悠然，芒鞋一兩千金直，不踏城中二十年[82]。

而清代初期陳鼎的《留溪外傳》的〈凡例〉中，把「不入城市」當作一個特殊範疇，並稱他們是「人種子」。雖然他的書中沒有舉太多例子[83]，但也足見當時有人清楚地覺察到有這麼一個特殊的社會群體。

關於「不入城」，這裡還要再作一點分疏，即不入城可以分成兩個層次，一種是除了不入「城」之外還不入「市」，一種是不入「城」但入「市」。「市」應該是指縣城郡城以外的市鎮。譬如徐昭法，全祖望在描述他時，便清楚地劃分他前後有兩種不同的生活型式，早期是不入城但顯然還入市，後來是不入城也不入市。全祖望說：

> 先生故不入城，及老於澗上，並不入市[84]。

故徐昭法是一個階段比一個階段嚴格，原先不入城，到後來連市集都不

81 可惜此文百尋不獲，只能從當時人的轉述略知其詳。

82 《明遺民錄》，頁182。

83 陳鼎，《留溪外傳》(清光緒戊戌武進盛氏重刊本)，〈凡例〉，頁1。他稱呼這些人是「俗所謂人種子也，足以標榜一時，啓發後世」。此外還有人是非常慎重、儘量減少入城的次數，像江西寧都魏禧，明亡時他二十歲，決心謝棄諸生服，隱居在翠微峰，因為祖廟在城中，故每年清明祭祀一入城而已。溫聚民，《明魏叔子先生禧年譜》(台北：商務印書館，1980)，頁9。

84 〈澗上徐先生祠堂記〉，《鮚埼亭集》，卷30，頁387。

進去了。不過像全祖望那樣提供精確描述的例子真是可遇不可求，大部分有關不入城的記載都只有幾個相當粗鬆的字眼，如「不入城」或「不入城市」而已，使得我們想進一步從社會、經濟或生活的層面加以分析都變得非常困難，這也是我在寫這篇文章時感到相當遺憾的地方。

在當時江南地區，一個人如果既不入城又不入市，那麼他的生活是非常不方便的。江南市鎮極多，如果一個人連市鎮都不進入，在交通上很不方便，恐怕有許許多多的地方都要繞道而行。在經濟方面，在鄉間有田莊地主階級，或是有宗族力量作爲依靠的人，自誓不入城之後，應該可以維持生活，但是，如果是城市出身的寒士，或必須靠著市場交易維生者，那麼既不入城又不入市，將會造成非常艱難的處境。吾人可以想像在當時江南，有一些誓不入城的人仍在市鎮中活動。至於當時的北方市鎮並不發達，所以所謂「不入城」，應該是指不入縣城或不入郡城，基本上也較少有「不入城」、「不入市」那樣細緻的區分。

不入城有現實上的理由，因爲城市是危險的地方。我們可以揣想，在明清政權更迭的初期，清兵主要是控制城市及交通要道，不入城市正可以避免官府的牽扯。當時四方牽連逮捕的案子極多，舊朝菁英動輒有被挾舊仇誣告的可能，而因爲朝代變換，舊有的官僚關係網絡大多失效，故一旦被攀告則危險性甚大，如徐石騏之子徐柱臣，地方上的惡霸便常脅迫要舉發他爲「義士頑民」，這種威脅存在了三十多年才結束[85]。故不入城是全身遠禍的辦法之一。城是官府所在地，不入城可以「不謁仕宦」，避免與新朝發生關係，同時不入城也可以避免被新朝重用或利用。清初徵修明史，徵博學鴻詞[86]，對許多人來說是大好機會，

---

85 孫靜菴，《明遺民錄》卷8，在《彙輯》，頁560。

86 劉永錫有一段經歷：「國初召用遺逸，令甲綦嚴，州縣吏遣差役四出，持牌票拘隱士，至永錫門，欲強之出。」(同前書，頁221)。李二曲的經歷更是驚心動魄。地方官吏屢屢來徵，用門板強抬李氏，李氏稱病，而富平縣甚至每月派人前往看他的疾病是否痊癒，一旦痊癒，即送北京，見陳俊民校編，《關中三李年譜》(台北：允晨出版公司，1992)，頁83。

但對另一批人而言卻是極大的困擾，有些人便以不入城來避免故舊的薦舉。作〈不入城說〉的劉若宜，便是因爲舊友成爲新朝大官，交相荐辟，故避門卻掃，絕跡不入城市，而且還作〈不入城說〉公開宣示[87]。此外，因城市是一個往來活動交集較多的空間，在城市中容易與相識的人碰面，故我們看到一些不入城者爲了避免與舊人相遇，故不再進入城市。如萊陽諸生董樵：

> 國變后，徙居文登海濱，日荷薪入市易米，人莫知其住處，有紳士要于路，欲與語。樵棄薪道左，詭云：「吾科頭，當取冠與公揖。」竟去不來……樵從此不復入市矣[88]。

董樵在明亡後已徙居海邊，迫於生活所需，仍得荷柴入市易米，沒想到有舊識攔在路中想要和他講話，他只好避去，「不復入市」。

不入城當然可以躲避兵災。明清之交天下大亂，城市被清兵燒掠的可能性甚大，所以城居是危險之事，不入城是怕危險，黃宗羲(1610-95)寫到萬斯年(1617-93)的事狀時也點出當時城市的危險性。他說：

> 俄逢喪亂，劍戟弧矢，鏗然遍於城市，居民惴惴，無不閉門聽難[89]。

孫夏峰(1584-1675)在一封信〈復范質公〉中也說：

> 戊寅之夏，(茅)止生謂敵當復來，州邑城非所恃也，因商所以

87 《明遺民錄》，頁134。

88 同前書，頁81。

89 〈萬祖繩墓誌銘〉，《黃宗義全集》冊十，頁473。

> 出門[90]。

黃宗羲寫到楊時儼時，更點出了大難必須逃鄉這一事實，說楊氏原本與陳子龍(1608-47)相善，加入幾社，本想與諸君子大展抱負，澤被生民，沒想到國運戛然而終。此後他遯於荒郊，「亡何，大兵圍城，城內之死者無算，而先生所居無一矢之遺，知者服其先見。」[91] 宣城吳肅公(雨若)也有一段生動的記載，談到他的母親如何勸戒他「無一步入郡城」：

> 當是時法嚴甚，動註誤，坦夷滅，己亥(順治十六年)海亂，邑人多附者，戒肅公等無一步涉郡城，已而附者罹大禍，或蜚語中肅公，卒不得閒[92]。

當時的記錄似乎印證了俗諺「小難逃城，大難逃鄉」。陸世儀《詩集》卷二〈無陋居十詠序〉：

> 予自丑寅間，知天下已亂，江南不能無事，即與友人輩歷選山水，欲求避世，而不可得。至癸未，乃結茅於城之西北水村，將終身焉[93]。

從魏禧(1624-80)的一篇〈告玄帝文〉，也可以看出當時城居之危險，這篇祭文是1647年寫的，他提到去年世亂，奉父母遷居翠微山：

90 《夏峰先生集》(畿輔叢書本)，卷1，頁32。
91 〈楊士衡先生墓誌銘〉，《黃宗羲全集》冊十，頁468。
92 鄧之誠，《清詩紀事初編》(北京：中華書局，1965)，頁127。
93 《陸桴亭先生遺書》，《詩集》，卷2，頁11。

> 大命既傾，新政時及，或敢逋隱，隨以重刑，戮其老幼，籍其田宅，是時父子兄弟徬徨無策，念潔身違禁，則祖宗之血食可傷，貶服遵時，則新政之風波不測，伯兄際瑞，毅然請行，謂審義禮則忠孝有重輕，權利害則死生有命數，身居長子，責在承祧，繇是冒險入城，污身存祀，豈惟二老之饔飧，藉茲忠養，即兩弟之身名，賴以苟全[94]。

魏家為了保全在城中的祖廟，兄弟之中必須有一人留在城中，最後決定由魏際瑞留下，文中說他「冒險入城，污身存祀」，足見當日城市之不安全。可是這種情況很快地有所改變。當清朝政權慢慢穩定下來，但卻還未能有效控制全國治安時，鄉村地區反而變得不安全起來，盜匪的記載所在皆是[95]，所以也有人在鄉居一小段時間後又移居城市[96]。

但在清廷下薙髮令之後，因為城市是官府所在地，所以不滿新政權的人遭禍的可能性相當多。譬如一個人不薙髮或不遵時服，在城市中就隨時有被邏卒逮捕之可能，譬如餘姚邵以貫與黃宗羲的兄弟黃宗會(1618-63)因為「冠服奇古」，在路上頻遭詰難[97]。服裝不合制或留辮髮的人只要入城，便成了一個活動的標靶[98]。所以不合時宜的人們又紛紛視城市為畏途。

但不入城有自我標榜的嫌疑，有時還會引起官方的不滿，前面提到劉若宜寫〈不入城說〉，根據錢秉澄《田間文集》中的報導，他在文中

94 《魏叔子文集》(台北：商務印書館，1973)，卷20，頁8。

95 清初地方上盜匪甚熾，小說《施公案》中所描寫的，未必非實況，值得深入研究。

96 如龍門戴光晨「甲申國變，移居增城」。(《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷3，在《彙輯》，頁1168。)又如陸世儀在搬到鄉村以避天下大亂之後，「居村僅一、二月，以土人亂，復入城。」(《陸桴亭先生遺書》，《詩集》，卷2，頁11。)

97 孫靜菴，《明遺民錄》，卷8，在《彙輯》，頁423。

98 侯涇原是另一個例子。侯氏在明亡之後，仍未剃髮，一僕問他：「君髮如此䯻䯻，保無有執汝以求利者乎？」同前書，頁437。

說自己因爲「老、貧、痛」才不入城，特意強調自己是「不欲以高尚爲名也」[99]。由此看來，「不入城」還得找個恰當的理由，才能做到既非標榜，又不招忌。

四、幾個「不入城」的故事

決心不入城的時機有早有晚，絕大部分是明亡後即自誓不入城的，但也有一些人是明亡後一段時間才決心不入城。不入城者的動機也有不同，誠如前述，有些人不入城是怕危險，但是大部分人不入城是出於不承認新的政權，或出於悔恨捨離的意識，在我隨手摘錄的八、九十個事例中(見附表)，因不承認現實政權之正當性而不入城的佔最大多數。這裡則想提出幾個記載較詳的例子。

第一個例子是徐昭法。明亡時徐昭法只有二十三歲，他父親命令家人從此不得賀歲[100]。明亡之後徐昭法過著相當貧困的生活，每天只吃一餐乾飯及一頓稀飯[101]。他決心不入城後，浪居在杭州西湖的汾湖、蘆區、金墅、靈巖、支硎、積翠等地，最後定居澗上[102]。康熙二十四年，江蘇巡撫湯斌(1627-87)微服拜訪他，徐氏預先走避，留老蒼頭宿於門外，扣門不啓[103]，這件事使得徐昭法聲名甚盛。

在不入城的幾十年中，徐昭法的生活來源之一是朋友們爲了濟助他所成立的一個畫社。彭紹升(1740-96)《二林居集》中有〈俟齋徐先生手帖跋〉，提到當時他的朋友籌資送他維持生活，但又怕傷了他的面

---

99 俞樾，《薈叢編》(上海：進步書局，無出版年)冊一，卷2，頁9，〈劉泰齋條〉。

100 羅振玉，《徐俟齋年譜》，在《明清史料彙編》七集(台北：文海出版社，1971)，頁11。

101 同前書，頁17。

102 全祖望，〈澗上徐先生祠堂記〉，《鮚埼亭集》卷30，頁387。

103 《徐俟齋年譜》，頁31。

子，故要求他作畫抵償[104]。徐氏的表弟朱用純在給他的一封信上勸他務必接受，說：「然以弟觀之，世路將來益復艱難，而年歲又必將有奇凶異災，……但於義之所無傷，力之所當盡者，則亦不必過爲溪刻自處，蓋畫社之舉亦友朋之所以交盡其誼。」[105] 清初有些流亡士人得到專爲籌措他們的生活費所結「義社」的資助[106]。不過，徐昭法的故事卻特別被神化，《南疆繹史》中說他是「豢一驢，馱書畫入城易物，識之者呼爲高士驢云云。」《南疆繹史》的故事版本後來又被《小腆紀傳》所承襲，所以一般不認爲有問題，直到羅振玉才痛加駁斥，認爲不可能如此神奇[107]。不過，即使這個故事是假的，它也反映了一種有趣的心態，在這個故事中，非但徐昭法不入城，連爲他馱畫的驢子也不入城，而是「立城闉間，不闌出一步」。這個故事當然再度提醒我們不入城者的經濟問題。當時買賣書畫的市場基本上還是在城市，所以徐昭法一旦決心不入城便難以維生了。

對徐昭法而言，不入城非但有經濟上的困難，而且還有種種危險及官吏之陷害。關於前者，反映在吳嘉楨的〈與俟齋書〉，他警告徐氏：

> 但空山不可久居，鄉村多盜，剽掠之患其小者也。近來匿影山阿者，多不測之禍，維斗、臥子、公旦、彥林無辜慘戮，大可畏也。況妒賢之人，此間不少，不以忠節仰慕，轉以立異萋菲，每聞其言，不勝浩嘆。倘有讒毀，作成機穽，誰能挽回，深為大兄慮之，今日之計，速速進城與二哥同居，兄弟相依，和光混俗，可以處亂，可以避禍，守身之道，不得不然，萬勿

104 彭紹升，《二林居集》（清光緒七年刊本），卷9，頁3。

105 此信附錄於《徐俟齋先生年譜》，頁110-1。

106 如前面的李天植，「時有好事者，約為月給」。見註121。如無錫邱維正、貴池蔡來雲皆流落海寧，而陳確等舉義社醵金以相資助，見陳確，〈義社告成漫記〉，《陳確集》，頁224-5。

107 《徐俟齋先生年譜》，頁44。

固執，遺事後之悔[108]。

足見不入城，不但可能被盜賊剽掠，還可能引起側目，讒毀於官府，所以他勸徐氏速速進城與其兄弟同住。

徐氏因爲誓不入城，城裡的家事也不可能親自處理，他的弟弟徐貫時遂藉機將田賦賴到他頭上[109]，以致徐昭法有因逋賦而被捕之事[110]，而徐昭法因誓不入城，竟無法親赴官府洗脫，這也是發生在誓不入城者身上大可玩味之事。

在這裡我想對當時的城市與生計的問題作一探討。陳洪綬(1599-1652)不是自誓不入城者，但是他在明亡之後隱居山間的一些境遇可以說明一個畫家處在城、鄉之間經濟生活的巨大差異。陳氏是劉宗周(1576-1645)的學生，他的老師及一群師友在明亡時紛紛殉國，他雖然沒有走上這一條路，但他在亡國之後入山隱居。尤其是在1646年到1647年3月間，他隱居舊塢，後來不得已才下山回到城市重拾賣畫生涯。在舊塢期間，他寫了〈避亂詩〉153首，從中可以看出不入城對他的經濟生活是很大的挑戰，而一旦入城，卻又有相當大的危險。「舊塢去城廿里餘」是〈思舊塢〉的第一句，接著他描述簡單的地理位置，然後說：

長槍米賈隔三家，草橋酒店遠二里，將家自全于其中，種菜曳柴命兒子。…酒錢少而米錢稀，然亦未曾飢渴死。出于故人遠寄將，答之詩畫頗歡喜。老媼捨我幾畝山，結個茅庵晨夕啓，…去冬總管欲識面，親朋勸我無去理，破衲光頭難拗違，親朋又勸出山是。總管為我慘淡謀，賣畫養生必城市[111]。

108 同前書，頁114-5。

109 同前書，頁40。

110 同前書，頁39-40。

111 《陳洪綬集》(杭洲：浙江古籍出版社，1994)，頁212-3。

詩人筆下的「賣畫養生必城市」的「城市」可能是縣城、郡城，也有可能是市鎮，從這一句詩可以看出陳洪綬與徐昭法一樣，如果不能躬自耕作，而是靠著文人的書畫來維生，那麼一旦不入市，經濟來源頓成問題。

陳洪綬的詩中還比較了在山中與在城市生活的不同。在〈梅墅舟還〉第六首中，他沈吟道：

山中有梅花，然而飢欲死，賣畫野市間，舟居而已矣[112]。

山中生活雖然悠閒，但是「飢欲死」，如果不入城，只有賣書畫於「野市」中。這與徐昭法之不能不賣畫於市中的情形是一樣的。在〈失題〉中他又吟道：

半載兵戈融，一朝揮手難，山中人盡餓，我忍自加餐？餬口宜城市，何必修藥欄[113]。

「山中人盡餓，餬口宜城市」，但是城市雖宜餬口，欲是危險的地方，故在〈雞鳴〉一詩中他又吟道：

難為隱君子，生活在市城，城市為生活，豈免見刀兵[114]？

陳洪綬之外，另一個值得一提的例子是江陰陸蘇。陸蘇是誓不入城市的人，他在清兵下江南後，焚巾衫，焚筆硯，舉家遷於船上，誓不登岸，惟有披網捕魚。這位斷絕於所有城市之外的讀書人需要米時，還是

112 同前書，頁182。
113 同前書，頁106。
114 同前書，頁85。

得「令童子入市換米以自給」[115]，足見他的生活不能全然與「城」或「市」切斷關係。傳統士人通常有大家族的支持，但是這並不是通例，有些人在決定不再入城後，生活非常逼仄。如李天植(1591-1672)，張庚(1681-1756)在〈檇李兩孝廉傳〉中說，李氏在喪亂後，把剩下的田四十餘畝，和一棟房子分給子女，與妻遁入山中：

> 自是足不入城市，訓童子自給，居七、八載，陳山寺僧開堂，聚聽者眾，避喧，反蜃園，復與妻居，賣文以生[116]。

這個故事有另一個版本，全祖望的〈蜃園先生神道表〉中說李天植賣文維生是不夠的，故他還和妻子一起製鞋賣人，即使如此也還不夠，還要靠關心他的人每月湊錢供應[117]。

並不是每一個不入城的人都終生持守不變。如李二曲，他在明亡後決定不入城，而且對清廷抱著不合作態度[118]。他雖不入城，不出門庭，而且與社會生活作最徹底的隔絕——築一座土室，將自己反鎖其中，自號爲「土室病夫」。他不入城的誓願顯然遠近皆知，故陝西巡撫鄂善(？-1679)雖雅慕其名，但「知先生不履城市，難以屈致」[119]。李二曲後來被鄂氏的誠意所感動，於康熙十二年關中書院修復之年，破戒入城——

> 是年，修復關中書院，拔各郡俊士於中，适因提學鍾朗致饑渴，又因咸寧郭丞通禮意，四月，肅幣聘先生講學。先生力辭

115《皇明遺民傳》，卷六，在《彙輯》，頁790。

116《清代碑傳全集》，卷124，頁622。

117 同前註。

118《二曲集》中便有痛責二臣的話。

119《歷年紀略》，康熙十二年條，見《二曲集》，卷45，頁579。

至再，鄂公敦延愈殷，三往然後應。鍾以先生衣服寬博不時，預製小袖時袍馳送，先生笑而藏之，仍寬博以往。至城南雁塔，鍾出城奉迎，見之愕然。先生曰：「僕非官僚紳士，又非武弁營丁，窄衣小袖，素所弗便。寬衣博袖，乃庶人常服，僕本庶人，不敢自異。且庶人無入公門之理，區區生平，安庶人之分，未嘗投足公門，今進書院，諸公見顧，斷不敢破戒報謁。」[120]

我們都知道李二曲曾經堅持不應博學鴻辭之詔，但是康熙皇帝卻一再堅持詔見，最後地方官員只好用門板強行將他抬走，後來幸而得到友人援助，才能免於進京。前面那一段引文透露出一個值得玩味之處，那就是李氏平常穿的衣服是「寬博不時」，提學鍾朗則「預製小袖時袍馳送」，但李二曲並未穿上，以致鍾氏在城南相迎時「見之愕然」。為什麼不穿「小袖時袍」會令官員「見之愕然」？那是因為「小袖時袍」才是清代的冠服[121]，但李二曲說「僕非官僚紳士，又非武弁營丁」，故未穿時袍，由此也可以看出當時並非人人都已換成新裝。

清初葉夢珠《閱世編》卷八有一條說：「本朝於順治二年五月克定江南時，郡邑長吏猶循前朝之舊，仍服紗帽圓領，升堂視事，士子公服、便服皆如舊式。惟營兵則變服滿裝，武弁臨戎亦然，平居接客則否。故薙髮之後，加冠者必仍帶網巾于內，髮頂亦大，無辮髮者但小帽改用尖頂，士流亦間從之。至三年丙戌春暮，招撫內院大學士亨九洪公承疇刊示嚴禁云：『豈有現為大清臣子而敢故違君父之命，放肆藐視，莫此為甚。』于是各屬凜凜奉法，始加錢頂辮髮，上去網巾，下不服裙邊，衣不裝領…」[122] 由這一段紀錄可以看出，清兵初定江南時，明代

120 同前引。
121 參見沈從文，《中國古代服飾研究》（台北：南天書局，1988）。
122 葉夢珠，《閱世編》（台北：木鐸出版社，1982），頁175。

的服制尚未廢除，即使薙髮，加冠者亦戴網巾於內，順治三年才因洪承疇之議而嚴格推行新朝冠服。李二曲一直到康熙十二年仍不穿「小袖時袍」，自然會令官員「見之愕然」了。

前面已經提到並不是所有誓不入城者的個案皆始自甲申。陸圻(1614-？)誓不入城顯然並不始於明亡，而是在莊廷鑨史案發生之後，否則不會有順治七年黃宗羲到崇德，而陸氏聽到消息，「強之入城」的事[123]。到了康熙元年莊氏史案發生後，陸氏受到極大的刺激與侮辱，才決定不入城。

康熙元年莊廷鑨史案中，查繼佐(1601-76)、范驤、陸圻無故被列爲莊書的參校人，他們雖然主動具文將自己的實際情形報告教諭，仍於當年十二月被督撫差官將三家共176人解京訊問。在整個過程中，因爲出現了並不光彩的情事，以致後來事白獲釋之後，陸圻甚爲自慚[124]，並斷然出家。一般都說他晚年不知所終，但我在金堡的《遍行堂集》中發現他留有幾封信，可以知道他在廣東一帶活動[125]。在陸氏祝髮之後，一度曾依他與家人之間的約定回到杭州。依照其女陸莘行的〈老父雲游始末〉中的描寫，可以知道他雖回杭州卻刻意不進城，而是住在城郊的庵中：

> 戊申正月，仲兄預于江干覓一精舍，號曰草菴，候至二月十七日，吾父果至……誓不入城，挈童子王保法名透月，居河渚庵

123 黃炳垕，《黃梨洲先生年譜》，《黃宗羲全集》冊十二，頁35。

124 黃宗羲《思舊錄》「庚寅，同宿吳子虎家，夜半，推余醒，問滃洲事，擊節起舞。余有懷舊詩：『桑間隱跡懷孫爽，藥籠偷生憶陸圻，浙西人物眞難得，屈指猶云某在斯。』史禍之後，麗京以此詩奉還云：『自貶三等，不宜當此。』請改月旦，其後不知所終。」（《黃宗羲全集》冊一，頁378。）鄧之誠對此有所解釋，見《桑園讀書記》（瀋陽：遼寧教育出版社，1998），頁82。

125 金堡，《遍行堂集》（清初刊本，北平圖書館微卷），尤其是卷28的多通書信，頁11-8。

中[126]。

直到三個月後，陸圻的弟弟病危，而陸氏本來就精岐黃之術，爲了救治自己親弟弟，陸圻才勉強入城。陸莘行說：

> 五月，三叔父病危，迎父入城，父不忍辭，至叔家施醫藥……九月，叔已平復，父召兄曰，吾以叔疾違約入城，吾之交廣，若使有疾，誰非當治者[127]？

陸圻在治完弟弟的病後，因爲怕自己將來不時會因爲朋友的病而進入城中，所以馬上遠遁。由陸圻之堅決不肯入城，並以入城爲「違約」，足見他發過誓願，不入城市，以表達他絕決棄去塵俗的態度。

也有一些發誓不入城的人，在不得已的情況下，在城外與親友見面的例子。如陸世儀《詩集》卷十中記戴笠(1614-82)，原名芸野，明亡之後改名笠，隱居樂善，不入城市。1669年春吳梅村招之，至崑山，宿於野寺。戴氏過去因讀《甲申紀事》而知陸世儀之名，便想趁在崑山時與陸氏一晤，他託友人持名刺給陸世儀，但卻堅決不願進城。陸氏接著說「予懷刺就之」。魏禧〈高士汪渢傳〉也說汪渢在亡國之後，提藥囊往來於山谷之間，食宿無定處。汪家城居，母親年老，希望再見汪渢一面，不得已，只好由其兄弟「奉母徙城外，渢閒來定省」[128]。汪氏來往游蕩於西湖附近，黃宗羲曾從浙東一度前來造訪，黃氏準備回杭州城時，汪渢送他到杭州的清波門外，不肯再往前走一步[129]。

---

126 《老父雲游始末》，鄧實等輯，《古學彙刊》(上海：國粹學報社，1912)五十一種冊七，頁6。

127 同前引。

128 《清代碑傳全集》，卷124，頁619。

129 《明遺民所知傳》，《彙輯》，頁331。

又有一次，黃宗羲與汪渢一起前往杭州拜訪張仲祐，但汪氏因有不入城之戒，所以「明日，余入雲居訪仁菴，魏美矢不入城，至清波門別去」[130]。一入杭城，一至清波門別去，兩者之間的不同是相當清楚的[131]。

不入城的誓約也可能是只持續一段特定的時間。如呂留良，他從四十六歲(1674)開始不入城，在聽說他的一位魏姓友人遷居山陰之前「渴思候語，一磬闊悰」時，呂氏因「適有不入城市之戒」，故他在給這位朋友的信上說「南望停雲，徒切懷想耳」[132]。呂氏另有〈與徐方虎書〉，說：

> 老畏城市，甚於萑苻不自知失保身之術，亦足見其迂戾而闇於事理，將來欲令家人入城，以此身委之而已[133]。

呂留良雖有「不入城市」之戒語，但並不反對家人將來入城，也不反對在船中與朋友相晤，只是不能踏入城市的土地而已。而且從他的口氣看來，不入城市帶來生活上的種種不方便，甚至帶來某種政治上的麻煩，所以說「將來欲令家人入城」。

不入城與不參加科舉考試一樣，只維持了一代人，在這殘明遺老逐

130〈汪魏美先生墓誌銘〉，《黃宗羲全集》冊十，頁382。

131 在談過清初一些不入城的個案後，此處必須強調，即使是在清初，並不是所有立志不入城的人都是代表一種在政治上或社會上完全的捨離，有的人仍只是表示求學的決心，如陸世儀筆下的毘陵蔡仲全，他十七、八歲時見福建顏茂猷以五經中進士，遂奮然效之，力通五經——「中酉間，遂絕意干祿，足跡不入城，一意讀書。」但馬上又說：「如是者數年始入城。」(陸世儀，〈毘陵蔡仲全先生小傳〉，在《陸桴亭先生遺書》《文集》卷6，頁24。)從這些材料看來，蔡仲全並不是拒絕清廷之功名的人，而且他在自覺學問有所成就的時候，還是再度入城。

132《呂晚村文集》，卷2，頁16。

133 同前書，卷4，頁1。

漸故世之後，不入城的情形就不存在了。從歷史文獻中，我們看到清代中晚期出現過零星幾個不入城的例子，不過他們多是爲了專心著述，完全沒有任何政治上的理由。到了這裡，清初那種政治上的不入城又變回文化的不入城[134]。

值得注意的是，那些「不入城」者，那些自我邊緣化的人，那些與社會最不接觸的人，反而能因對一切說「不」而得到人們的尊敬。當清朝的局勢穩定下來時，忠孝節義很快又得到重視，不入城市者每每得到很高的聲望，所以在不入城者的傳記中，常常見到新朝大員造訪的記載[135]，也常有故舊在新朝成爲大官，希望與誓不入城的舊人見面不得的故事[136]。值得注意的是，他們每拒絕一次，他們的社會聲望便又提高一層。不斷的拒絕或捨離，成爲累積聲望的來源。而他們究竟是否能守住原則、拒絕到底，也成爲眾所關心的、具有高度象徵意義的話題。譬如湯斌是否見到徐昭法的問題，一直到清末革命黨人還在討論。陳去病在清末所寫的《五石脂》中堅持他們兩個人最後還是有往來[137]。陳氏在《五石脂》中抄錄湯斌給徐昭法的兩封信，由信中內容證明湯斌曾經請徐昭法爲他鑒定黃道周的手跡，足見他們最後是見了面的[138]。不過，民國初年羅振玉在編《徐俟齋先生年譜》時，卻堅持「當日踰垣以

134 譬如乾嘉經學大家焦循便為了專心學術，在生母歿服除之後，「託足疾不入城市者十餘年」，這十幾年中，他讀書著述於「雕菰樓」。《清史稿》，卷482，列傳269。

135 如張怡，《彙輯》，頁616。

136 如呼谷，同前書，頁1470。

137 他說自己曾見過湯、徐二人的通信，「如湯孔伯致徐俟齋諸書，頗證二人絕不往來之謬。蓋為朝廷來，可逾垣辟之，若為個人通殷勤，固無所用其麾卻也。」蘇州博物館等編，《丹午筆記》、《吳城日記》、《五石脂》合刊本（南京：江蘇古籍出版社，1999），頁305。

138 其中一封說：「刻偶有賈者，持黃石齋先生書贈諸合甫詩冊頁一部貿弟，字法頗道健，忠義之氣，溢于字裏行間。弟不能鑒古，而此冊則知為眞跡，特持奉請覽，乞題數字於後，更足為黃公增重也。俟齋先生高士，弟湯斌頓首。」同前引。

避，兩賢未嘗識面」。因爲滿清宗室昭槤的《嘯亭雜錄》說湯氏訪徐昭法，久乃得見，並食以粗糲，「文正不敢不飽」；到嘉道年間，甚至有僞造湯、徐來往書札，極道相見之歡是僞造的故事，故羅氏接著說：「夫據傳聞以致記載失實，此失之無心也。僞札之作，則誣高賢而惑後世，其罪莫可逭矣。」[139]我們沒有進一步史料，不知陳去病所錄的兩封書札是否即嘉道間之僞作。不過兩人是否相見確實不斷引起注意，它之所以值得注意，主要便是徐昭法數十年不入城所代表的高度象徵意義。羅振玉作《徐俟齋先生年譜》已在清亡之後，他是以一個遺民的身分去講另一個遺民，他特別強調徐氏的忠節，那是對遜清而發的。

從本文〈附錄〉中的資料看來，不入城者的地域遍及各地，並不特別限在哪些省份，不過江南及廣東所見到的例子特別多，這應該是與這兩個地區與清兵對抗最烈而遭到屠戮最慘有關。當時有幾個地方是不入城者較常聚居之所，一個是揚州、儀徵附近的北湖，如王玉藻、王方魏等都避居此地，一直到清代中期，焦循(1763-1820)還寫了一部《揚州北湖小志》，記載遁藏這個地區的賢士[140]。另一個是杭州城外的山區。他們自成社群，故有「遺民故老時時猶向陽羨山中，流連痛飲」之類的記錄[141]。

不過，不入城並不是一種組織性的行爲，沒有過大聲疾呼的宣言，也未見有任何組織，但卻不約而同地發生在各地[142]。不入城有多方面的意義，它是一種自我誓約，一種決裂的態度，儘可能地切斷與世俗的

139《徐俟齋先生年譜》，〈序〉，頁2。

140 焦循，《揚州北湖小志》，在《焦氏遺書》(清嘉慶十三年刊本)。

141《彙輯》，頁756。矢志不入城者的生卒年大多不易查得，所以很難在這裡全面勾勒出他們矢志不入城時的大致年歲。

142 這裏要稍微討論一下「遺民錄」這一類材料的性質。「遺民錄」是後人根據特定標準收集人物資料而成，並將這樣一群人稱為遺民，但在行動者本身，並不一定有清楚的集體意識，所以收集在各種遺民錄中的人物是不約而同的行動者。

連繫。既然無法改變改朝換代這一事實，便以消極的切斷社會政治連繫來表達自己，是無可奈何中的一種強勢的作爲。否定是積極的，而逃避是消極的，不入城者是藉著否定來自我肯定。不入城是主體性很強的超越性舉動，但卻是一種莫可奈何的超越。不入城者並未建立何種新價值，反而代表著舊文化菁英的自我邊緣化。

我們在西方歷史固然見到過一些反對城市文化的例子[143]，但是並未看到過不入城的運動，而在中國歷史上，除了這一個時期外，即使在其它的改朝換代之際，也未見到相類似的現象[144]，那麼這個現象的產生，除了因「城」代表新朝政治的力量及正統性之外，恐怕還與部分士人對明代非常燦爛的城市文化所持的負面印象有關，不能單純地以政治因素來加以解釋。

五、不結社、不赴講會、不收門徒

最後，我想把焦點更爲集中，討論發生在士人社群中的一些微妙變化：不結社、不赴講會、不收門徒、一書不兩序。

明代文人的群體性活動非常之盛，黨社數目之大，一時不易計數，但亡國卻改變了這個風氣。清初吳中社集仍有一段光景，但慢慢地就沒落了。

在明季已有人開始對結社感到不祥，寧波陸符(文虎)曾認爲「門氣長於同人，亂亡之兆也」，所以「凡遇刻文結社求爲序者，循環此意，

143 Jeffrey K. Hadden, Josef J Barton, "An Image That Will Not Die: Thoughts on the History of Anti-Urban Ideology," in Louis H. Masotti and Jeffrey K. Hadden eds., *The Unbanization of the Suburbs*(London: Sage Publications LTD, 1973), pp. 79-116.

144 梁庚堯兄告我，在宋代文集中極少見到不入城的例子。我讀程敏政所編《宋遺民錄》也未見到這類事例。

皆使人見之而覺悟。」[145]「同人」是指《易》同人卦，在這裡指的便是文人結社。萬應隆在明季曾入南社，入清也曾一度參加會試，未終場而出，此後不但不仕，而且也不敢再結社以應聲氣，其〈七十初度〉一律有云：

晚知此道能亡國，何敢今時尚署門[146]。

此處的「署門」二字，是題字於門之義，用的是《史記・汲鄭列傳》「今乃大署其門，曰：一生一死，乃見交情」的典故，指的是朋友之間的集會結社。他說晚年才知道「此道能亡國」，是對自己早年熱中結社而生的痛悔之感。

明季主張不入社的士人代表當時一種新的態度，嘉興施博，「居郡城，平生未嘗入社」[147]；屠弘胤，崇禎間東南文社最盛，凡屠氏的同年摯友，無不欲引屠氏入社以爲重，屠氏卻一概謝絕，未嘗涉足[148]。陸大行痛悔結社之害，說社集「其盟主幾若齊秦之欲自帝於東西，署置同事，名曰首勛，擯排異已，謂之屏放，狂惑至此，播爲亂氣，若瀾倒隄決，莫之堙塞。」他曾馳書宣城沈眉生，相期禁絕入社。全祖望說他隱然比當時熱心社盟之人於「盜賊」[149]。明亡之後，屠天生之子屠鼎忠，在其父殉節之後，杜門謝客，當時甬上遺民結詩社，皆欲招之，屠鼎忠曰：此時結社，「非亡國大夫所宜」，可說繼承了其父的主張[150]。以上這些反對入社的例子，代表一種對囂張學風的反對與抵制。

145 黃容，《明遺民錄》卷四，在《彙輯》，頁789。
146 轉引自郭紹虞〈明代文人集團〉，在《照隅室古典文學論集》（上海：上海古籍出版社，1983），頁591。
147 《張楊園先生全集》，卷32，頁21。
148 同前書，卷33，頁7。
149 〈陸大行環堵集序〉，《結埼亭集》外編，卷25，頁996。
150 《六經堂遺事》，頁3。

改朝換代當然也硬生生地拆散了許多在明季赫赫揚揚的社集(如「讀書社」)[151]。而康熙四十八年的禁止民間結社，當然對晚明以來的結社之風給予進一步的打擊。

接著要談不赴講會的現象。明代中期以後講會極爲盛行，到處可以看到「聯五、七同志」在一起講學的例子。我覺得有一則笑話可以說明當時講學之盛，《雪濤諧史》中說，「黃郡一貧生自標講學，其鄉紳曰：此子有志。以一牛贈之。貧生牽回，其兄即收牛耕地，生怒，兄曰：有無相通，何得見怒？生應曰：誰叫你不去講學，也討個牛。」[152] 這則笑話說明了講學與實際利益是分不開的。羅汝芳等人的講會，有時聽眾達到千人，鄒元標(1551-1624)甚至說羅汝芳的官府中「皂隸亦講學」[153]。他們認爲這是從事下層啓蒙的重要工作，但是明季已有人對此不滿。《明儒學案》記顧憲成(1550-1612)、允成(1554-1607)兄弟一段對話：「一日，(允成)喟然而嘆，涇陽曰：何嘆也？曰：吾嘆夫今之講學者，恁是天崩地陷，他也不管，只管講學耳。」[154] 講學所討論的心性問題，辯析到牛毛繭絲般細微，一旦對心性問題有新的發現或體驗，參與者們皆有談微言中之喜悅與滿足感，對講學社群本身的熱誠已超過對社會國家的關懷，不必太究心現實的事務，即使碰到現實事務，也有很多人認爲要用講學來解決[155]。但這一風氣很快地要受到明亡這個事實的挑戰。顧炎武說今日只當著書，不當講學。顧憲成的孫子顧樞，從少年開始跟從高攀龍講性命之學，史書說他在明亡之後，作風

151 讀書社的社友鄭鉉「嘗與吳應箕、黃宗羲、(黃)宗會、沈壽民等流連西湖，……王師下浙江，諸社名士皆散。」《彙輯》，頁1073。

152 江盈科，《雪濤諧史》，在《江盈科集》(長沙：岳麓書社，1997)，頁869。

153 鄒元標，《願學集》(文淵閣四庫全書本)，卷5上，〈文江證道記〉，頁3。

154 《明儒學案》(北京：中華書局，1985)，卷60，頁1469。

155 當明末時局危險時，馮從吾、劉宗周等大儒還認為是講學講得不夠，馮從吾甚至還說「講學誠今日御敵要著」，足見講學在他們心目中之地位。轉引自陳寶良，《悄悄散去的幕紗—明代文化歷程新說》(西安：陝西人民教育出版社，1988)，頁168。

完全改變了，「韜形遁跡，不入城市，不赴講會」[156]。遁居在江西寧都翠微山的魏禧也是以絕口不談講學而爲時人所稱道[157]。

此外，像劉宗周的弟子張履祥，在思想風氣將變之時，他在許多方面都有新作風，其中便包括拒收學生、恥入社而且與人相戒不參加社盟、不參加講學。這三點都是刻意要反對晚明學界的風氣[158]。雷鋐在〈張履祥傳〉中便說他「未嘗敢以講學爲人師也」[159]。與張氏相友善的劉宗周之子劉汋(1613-64)也公開宣示他不赴講會[160]。在晚明，勸人講學是一件好事，在清初，卻會被譏爲「欺世盜名」。鄭性曾經勸李東門講學，東門卻笑他說：「今世之講學者，特欺世以盜名耳，吾不屑爲也。」[161] 陳確也力主辭卻任何講會，而且稱許別人不赴社是好消息[162]。周應賓《識小篇》的〈內篇〉有一段案語，極力批評當時仍在江浙地區講學不休的黃宗羲等人說：

> 講學至羅、李，直是一厄，今黃太沖輩藉此以圖衣食，掃地盡矣[163]。

156《明遺民錄》，頁60。

157《彙輯》，頁1182。

158 他「病當世講學者騁口辯、沽虛名，故于來學之士，未嘗受其拜，一以友道處之」。《明遺民錄》，頁17。鄧之誠《清詩紀事初編》頁239說張履祥與人相戒不與社盟。

159《清代碑傳全集》，頁636。

160《彙輯》，頁1001。

161 全祖望，〈五嶽遊人穿柱文〉，在《鮚埼亭集》，頁252。

162 譬如他說：祝鳳師「頃從諸少年舉一社，其諸父為言，亦止不赴，皆是好消息。」《陳確集》，頁589。《陳確年譜》順治十二年條：「是時，東南社集盛興，先生並辭不往，有濱社者，每會聯舟數百艘，以書招先生，亦謝不赴。」同前書，頁851。

163 該書尚未得寓目，轉引自廈門大學歷史系編，《李贄研究參考資料》第二輯（福建：福建人民出版社，1976），頁165。

羅是羅汝芳，李是李贄。呂留良也說：

> 正嘉以後，諸公講學紛紜，病譫夢囈，皆因輕看經義，不曾用得工夫，未免胡亂差卻路頭耳[164]。

又說：

> 講學之事，但是非其所知，亦生平所憎疾而不欲聞也[165]。

呂留良在這裡強調他自己是反「正嘉之後，諸公講學紛紜」之傳統，足見國亡之後，士人不約而同地對正德嘉靖以來的學風有一深刻的反省與拒斥。朱書(1657-1707)在〈答王昆繩〉中便直接指出正嘉以來講學之風，是陽明學開啓的，他說陽明之失，失在講學，率天下之人盡成爲王艮、王龍溪、顏山農、羅近溪、趙大洲、何心隱、李卓吾之徒，「棄禮法，任放誕，詐諼從衡，肆無忌憚，……古未有在位而講學者，凡講學于居官之日，皆竊所不取。」[166]

在這些拒斥晚明思想文化活動的健將中，最顯著的代表人物便是顧炎武。顧氏認爲明季士人文化蕩盡了善良醇厚的風俗，所以他處處刻意反潮流，也常常惹來同輩學人的爭議，譬如他深斥講學，便有人寫信給他表示抗議，李二曲爲此一再與他商榷，希望說服他講學是拯救風教最切實的工作。他的好友歸莊更與他持相反立場，認爲明之所以亡，便是因爲講學不力，但是顧炎武仍不以爲然。在給朋友的信中提到決不講學，即使是對自己大力支持的關中考亭書院的邀請也不願破例——

164〈答葉靜遠書〉，《呂晚村文集》，卷1，頁28。

165 同前書，卷2，〈答某書〉，頁173。

166 朱書，《朱書集》(合肥：黃山書社，1994)，頁103。

> 關中有考亭書院之舉，弟以譾陋，謬主其事，然不坐講席，不收門徒，欲盡反正德以來諸老先生之风習[167]。

顧炎武與呂留良一樣，公開表明自己反的作風是爲了「盡反正德以來諸老先生之風習」。顧氏除了一再申說他不願講學聚徒外，還堅持不寫應酬文字。他甚至反對用「同年」二字，反對夜赴宴會。反對一書有兩篇以上的序[168]，這些都不是偶然而發的。《湧幢小品》說明季沈靖峰太史文集每卷有序，全書共有序二十四篇[169]，當時這一類例子不少，顧炎武的一書不二序，正是針對這種風氣而發的，不但顧炎武主張一書不二序，與他同時代的李二曲也自誓「凡序、記、表、銘，一切酬應之作，類非幽人所宜」[170]。他們所堅持的「不」，皆是針對明季文人文化而發的，放棄原先流行的學術活動方式，當然是有深刻的動機。

以上諸人大抵認爲晚明的講學、結社，是提倡門戶、互相標榜，是鶩虛聲而無實學，是對國家社會事務毫不關心，是引起士大夫圈的意見分裂與擾攘不休，是破壞社會秩序的主因。他們把講學、結社與亡國連繫起來，講學能亡國，結社能亡國，這樣嚴重的指控嚇退了一大批人。這些批判行爲早在明末的最後二十年已經開始出現，但是那還只是知識圈內的轉變，改朝換代則使得原先那些令人覺得聒噪的聲音得到莫大的力量，他們居然說對了。亡國使得人們有一個支點去反省明代的講學文化，它好像是把瓶蓋塞起來了，使得瓶內的空氣不再進進出出，使得它的成分確定下來，可以好好進行分析。在晚明文化圈中認爲是瀟灑的，在他們看來則是戕害世道，在晚明學者看來是闡揚聖學的，他們看來是

---

167 《顧亭林詩文集》，頁200。

168 以上見同前書，頁67、86、96、213。

169 《湧幢小品》，頁420。

170 《二曲集》，頁232。

亡國的禍因[171]，明代那些赫赫揚揚的學術活動的方式也在這個大潮中逐漸退出歷史舞台。

結論

思想、文化或生活方式的中斷或不再繁衍，是改變歷史發展的重要因素。歷史上的大思想家常做兩件工作，一是選擇不再繁衍舊的，而且在中止繁衍時，不必然已經發展出一套繁密的新理論來加以取代，只是用一些簡單的話從外面加以勾銷。一是開創新的。這兩種工作的影響都很重要。

從以上所述，可以看出從明末到清初，有一大批士人有意識地做三件事，第一是批判文人階層的生活方式，第二是批判明代文人文化中的某些風習，第三是一批士人社會生活的自我邊緣化。這三者都影響了明代文化的繼續滋長，使得清代文化有不大一樣的面貌。

上述三種發展是何時開始的，也就是說晚明文化的這些特質何時開始逐漸消逝，這個問題至不容易確切加以回答，但至遲在明代最後二十年已經開始出現，並逐漸與當時流行的文人文化形成兩個相對的力量，而1644年的改朝換代加速了「修正派」的發展。我們從前面的文章中可以看到幾個反覆出現的大名字，像顧炎武、張履祥、呂留良、陸世儀。

---

171 反對講學、講會的人常即是反王學的人。不過反王學的健將中也有人為了徹底肅清正嘉以來的文化空氣，故凡講會必赴的，他們覺得自己有必要藉助講會來切磋、宣揚他們的「正學」。如安徽休寧的汪佑，崇禎末即開始隱居，「友人楊景陶邀赴還古書院會講，佑見所講多雜陸王之說，乃與同人發明程朱正學。」他極力反對陽明學派無善無惡宗旨，故決定要盡力破除此「害」，說「紫陽書院，正吾黨講學明道之壇坫也」，「乃與汪正叔、江衛道、汪月岩、胡鉋更、吳敬庵、汪石樵、吳慎先、汪括齋、朱濟臣、陳書始、謝兼善等人，振興紫陽大會，訂六邑同人，歲以朱子生日行釋菜禮，講學三日，……」此外，「若休城四孟會，白岳聖誕會、各邑塾月講會，皆不憚遠涉，應期必赴」（《明遺民錄》，頁89-90），他們到處講論，為的便是廓清所謂王學遺毒。

他們這裡也批評，那裡也批評，而終歸一句話，他們對晚明士人學術活動的方式或晚明的文人文化都懷有極大的不滿，想將學術文化帶入一個平實的、嚴謹的、樸素的、禮法的新方向，而這些竟不期然與新朝希望穩定社會政治秩序的要求相合。亡國也使舊的一批文化菁英失去現實的物質經濟憑藉，逼使人們對晚明的思想文化及生活習性進行了深刻的反省。戰亂流離及許許多多簪纓世家的潰敗[172]，使得舊文人酒食爭逐式的生活方式失去了條件，同時舊的思想文化也逐漸失去了它的聽眾，政治劇變造就了一批品味與風格不同的聽眾。

毫無疑問的，改朝換代是一個重大轉捩點，它使得晚明開始出現的修正派得到鼓勵，覺得他們的批判方向基本上是對的。改朝換代也使得一些「不」的反思得到一個支點，使得他們更加振振有詞，也使得行動者更爲堅定，但從以上所述也可以看出，早在明代末期，這些「不」多已零星出現，但它們出現在明末與大量湧現於清初，意義不盡相同。在明末，文化反思的意義較多，到清初，則是政治的意義較重，而且「文化」與「政治」常常是交雜在一起的，他們相信文化上的「頹廢」是政治崩潰的一個要因。如果用一個通俗的比喻，則其情形正是政治騎在文化的馬背上，文化也騎在政治的馬背上。

但是這裡還是要再度強調一點，以免讀者誤會，那就是晚明文人多采多姿的生活方式並未在1644年中斷，事實上，自由、享樂的風格在清初文人中仍可以看到，譬如說從金聖嘆的行事風格，或從《檀几叢書》、《昭代叢書》中所收的種種清初文人著作，都可以看出它的延續。所以從消褪到絕盡是逐漸發生的，而順治十八年頒臥碑，康熙年間三藩之亂平定，及康熙四十八年禁結社，都促使當時士人的生活風習轉入一個新局。

此文並不想對明代文化或清代文化作優劣的判斷。事實上如果從近

172 如《閱世編》，頁114-134。

三百年學術的正統觀點來看，清代的學術文化當然遠遠高於明季那種灑脫而不實在的文化，清代的士風平實(有時候是「平庸」)，學問樸素、嚴謹，而奠定這種學問風格的幾位大儒正是批評明季文化的健將，他們主要的工作之一，便是抑「浮」返「實」，而他們也確實做到了，所以平實的士風與樸實嚴謹的學問一方面是成就，從另一角度看則是晚明文人文化的消沈、壓抑，兩者之間並沒矛盾。

從表面看來，上面所描述的那種消極的、自我邊緣化的特質，和謝國楨等人筆下的遺民世界似乎頗有差異。謝國楨筆下的一批遺民，他們在天崩地解之時，依然胸懷開闊，志氣節操皆甚可觀，創造了許多虎虎有生氣的作品，謝氏認爲所謂「奄奄無生氣」，是清儒故意貶低這些人的話，他說自己筆下的一些人看來消沈，但事實上是潛伏在社會底層，講學論道，呼吸相通[173]。到底這兩種觀點，何者爲是？我想應該這樣說，遺民世界的面目本來就是多樣的，本文所講的，只是其中一個面向而已，更何況我在文中提到的這些懺悔或自我邊緣化的人，並不就表示他們奄奄無生氣，事實上許多潛伏在鄉里的人，回到他們所認爲的儒家正統文化的核心，而且正因爲他們斷絕與現實政治的關係，放棄科舉，思想反而更爲活潑，關注的事物更多樣。因爲不必理會八股時文而全心專注於經書及其他主題的研究，有的完成極具價值的著作，有的開拓藝術的新境界，有的是發展出對歷史文化極具見解的批判，有的是對政治的原理進行深刻的反省。

所謂消極，一方面是對晚明思想文化，一方面是對新的政權而言。消極性行爲在某種程度上說來也可能是一種積極性行爲。從行爲者本身來說，是要非常積極而決斷才能對種種事情說「不」，同時，在對那麼多東西說「不」之後，其實也等於重新劃出文化的疆界，「不」做什麼，或「悔」、「恨」做過什麼，使得這些行爲不再被他們視爲理所當

173 謝國楨，《明末清初的學風》(北京：人民出版社，1982)，頁20-21、171。

然，使得某些書從此不再爲士人社群所重視而隱入歷史的角落[174]。選擇了某些而又忽略了某些，使得思想文化的發展走入另一個方向；不做這些行爲，要做那些行爲，也使得士人生活風習產生改變，那麼消極性的「不」，如果換一個角度來看，卻是積極的。

從歷史效應上來看，不管是以行動表示對明代文人文化的不滿，或是在亡國之後以某種行動表達一種斷絕、捨去的意識，不管行動者的本意如何，其客觀的結果便是一種文化及生活方式的消逝。過去我們在研究明清之間思想文化的變化時，偏重在清代文化學術的興起，而忽略了明代某些文化特質的消逝，並且忽略了因爲不延續性，造成了「明型文化」與「清型文化」的不同。忽略了明末及清初士人逐步放棄其學問或生活、品味的方式，實具有深刻的歷史意義[175]。中止舊文化「再生產」並不必然意味著新文化的產生，不過廣大士人停止再生產自己原來的一套生活方式，自然也就爲新生事物讓出一條路來。

舊的文化風格如此，舊的文化菁英亦如此，舊的文化菁英隱入歷史舞台以及它所產生的客觀效應相當值得注意。以社集的消沉爲例，原來東奔西跑的那一批菁英們大多不再活躍，不再在士大夫圈中扮演領導性的角色，隱入一個新時代的底層[176]。他們有些仍然在士人圈中活動，甚至擁有相當的聲望，但不再成爲一股集體的士人力量。他們的歷史舞

174 像文震亨的《長物志》這樣的書，在清代的書目中被忽略，Graig Clunas, *Superfluous Things*(Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), p.169.

175 如果我們細加留意，便可再發現許許多多明代文人風習斷絕的例子。譬如縱橫一時的「山人」，在清代幾乎不再出現了。

176 以復社社員為例，入清以後，雖然也有幾個大官，但多的是知縣、教諭、學正、訓導，而更多的是沉隱下層。吳山嘉輯，《復社姓氏傳略》(北京：中國書店，1990)的〈例言〉上說：「姓氏錄共二千二百四十人，其達者豐功偉節彪炳史策，……惟布衣之士潛修勵志，或更易名姓韜晦終身，欲求其嘉言懿行，渺不可得，故未考者尚有千人。」(頁2)清代後期方東樹在〈明季殉節附記序〉中說：「秀水朱竹垞得復社姓氏錄，以其後事徵之，死於布褐而無聞者十之三，是則地處僻遠而史不及書，名位卑微而史又不及書。」(《儀衛軒文集》(清同治年間刊本)，卷5，頁9。)

台也讓位於一群新的士人。

舊文化活動的參與者或消費者的隱沒，使得舊式的文化活動失去了維持活力的生態條件，這些現象與明清之間文化活動的興衰有著密切的關聯。而無論如何，對於新朝統治者而言，舊文化風格及舊文化菁英的隱沒，對新政權的穩定與新文化形態的確立是有利無害的，晚明文化菁英的生活方式與文化活動的褪逝，間接幫助了新朝的鞏固，展現了文化與權力之間，消極互動的弔詭性關係。

後記： 本文初稿完成於1998年春天，但因各種因素而遷延再三，未能定稿，直到現在才寫成，藉以紀念英時師從普林斯頓大學退休。選擇這篇文章刊在這個專輯上當然是經過特別考慮的：英時師曾自矢不再踏上中共土地，我主觀覺得這與「不入城」的傳統有相互輝映之處。

附錄

不入城的事例

孔鼎	《皇明遺民傳》，卷4，在《彙輯》，頁11。
王方魏	《明遺民錄》，頁143。
王玉璣	黃容，《明遺民錄》，卷6，在《彙輯》，頁74。
王光承(1606-77)	《皇明遺民傳》，卷4，在《彙輯》，頁83。
王武徵	吳德旋，《初見樓聞見錄》(台北：商務印書館，1976)，卷4，頁1。
王建常(1615-？)	《明遺民錄》，頁109。
王思任(1576-？)	張岱，〈王謔菴先生傳〉，《張岱詩文集》，頁287、290。
王荃	金吳瀾等修，《崑新兩縣續修合志》(清光緒六年刊本)，卷24，頁40。
王餘佑(1615-84)	錢仲聯主編，《清詩紀事》(南京：江蘇古籍出版社，1987)，頁152。
王繼統	《明遺民錄》，頁169。
丘嘉彩	《皇明遺民傳》，卷6，在《彙輯》，頁112。
白奐彩(1607-84)	《清史稿》，卷480，列傳267。
牟賢	黃容，《明遺民錄》，卷1，在《彙輯》，頁161。
何仁隆	《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷2，在《彙輯》，頁168。
何其偉	孫靜庵，《明遺民錄》，卷16，在《彙輯》，頁172。
余正元	《皇明遺民傳》，卷1，在《彙輯》，頁179。
余若水	張岱，〈余若水先生傳〉，《張岱詩文集》，頁283-4。
宋之盛	《清史稿》，卷480，列傳267。
芮城	《皇明遺民傳》，卷6，在《彙輯》，頁421。
李天植(1591-1672)	《明遺民錄》，頁238-9。

李正雄	《明季滇南遺民錄》卷上，原取材自《騰衝疊疊水河李氏家譜》，在《彙輯》，頁294。
李任明	《明季滇南遺民錄》卷上，取材自《大理縣志》，在《彙輯》，頁294。
李成性	〈節自李處士傳〉，《顏元集》，頁477。
李明性(1615-83)	王源，〈李孝愨先生明性傳〉，《清代碑傳全集》，卷126，頁630。
李長祚	《咸豐興化縣志》，卷8，轉引自趙景深、張增元編，《方志叢錄元明清曲家傳略》(北京：中華書局，1987)，頁146。
李重熙	陳去病，《明遺民錄》，《國粹學報》60期，在《彙輯》，頁302。
李潛昭	《初月樓聞見錄》，卷5，頁3。
沈桂芳	黃容，《明遺民錄》，卷2，在《彙輯》，頁349。
汪溥	黃容，《明遺民錄》，卷6，在《彙輯》，頁334。
汪渢(1618-65)	《明遺民錄》，頁159-60。
呼谷	〈呼德下紀略〉，《清代碑傳全集》，卷36，頁1470。
周大績	《武林坊巷志》，卷2，頁207。
周楫	《崑新兩縣新修合志》，卷32，頁18。
邵泰清	《明遺民所知傳》，在《彙輯》，頁424。
俞粲	《明遺民錄》，頁97。
查潛	《初月樓聞見錄》，卷2，頁3。
洪思	《明遺民錄》，卷2，在《彙輯》，頁474。
洪錫祚	《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷2，在《彙輯》，頁475-8。
胡長庚	《皇明遺民傳》，卷6，在《彙輯》，頁488。
范苹	陳去病，《明遺民錄》，《國粹學報》31期，在《彙輯》，頁493。
范鄗鼎	陳俊民校編，《關中三李年譜》，頁106。

夏羽王	張怡德撰狀，《國朝耆獻類徵初編》(明代傳記叢刊本)，卷474，頁57。
夏道一	《明遺民錄》，頁61。
孫爽	《皇明遺民傳》，卷6，在《彙輯》，頁517。
徐介	厲鶚，《東城雜記》(台北：商務印務館，1976)，卷上，頁13。
徐夜(1611-83)	陳去病，〈徐東癡先生傳〉，《碑傳集補》，在《清代碑傳全集》，卷36，頁1469。
柴紹炳	《皇明遺民傳》卷4，在《彙輯》，頁471。
袁立俊	《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷2，在《彙輯》，頁577。
袁潤	《明季滇南遺民錄》，卷上，在《彙輯》，頁574。
屠廷楫	《彙輯》，頁807。
巢鳴盛(1611-80)	邵廷采，《思復堂文集》(台北：華世出版社，1977)，卷12，頁67。
常延齡	《皇明遺民傳》，卷6，在《彙輯》，頁606。
張子容	《初月樓聞見錄》，卷7，頁5。
張光啓	陳田輯編，《明詩紀事》(上海：上海古籍出版社，1993)，頁3545。
張作楠	《清史稿》，卷478，列傳265。
張怡(1608-95)	《國朝耆獻類徵初編》，卷478，頁51。
張若仲	《明詩紀事》，頁3220。
張聖型、張聖域	《明遺民錄》，頁263。
曹元方	《皇明遺民傳》，卷2，在《彙輯》，頁682-3。
梁應材	《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷1，在《彙輯》，頁700。
梁璉	《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷2，在《彙輯》，頁685-6。 湯中，《梁質人先生份年譜》(台北：商務印書館，1990)，頁12。
郭人一	《陸桴亭先生遺書》，《文集》，卷6，〈陳母王孺人守

	節紀略〉，頁10。
陳所學	《明遺民錄》，頁63。
陳貞慧(1604-56)	《國朝耆獻類徵初編》，卷463，頁17。 《明遺民錄》，在《彙輯》，頁755。
陳國瑛	《明遺民錄》，頁331。
陳禮	《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷4，參《高州府志》、《電白縣志》，《彙輯》，頁733-4。
麥向高	《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷1，在《彙輯》，頁752。
程白玉	黃容，《明遺民錄》，卷5，在《彙輯》，頁839。
鈕應斗	黃容，《明遺民錄》，卷3，在《彙輯》，頁852。
楊志達	《皇明遺民傳》，卷6，在《彙輯》，頁918。
楊爾誠	《初月樓聞見錄》，卷2，頁7。
楊維峻	《明季滇南遺民錄》，卷上，在《彙輯》，頁927。
楊維熊	孫靜庵，《明遺民錄》，卷15，在《彙輯》，頁927。
葛惟嶽	《初月樓聞見錄》，卷6，頁5。
董樵	《皇明遺民傳》，卷3，在《彙輯》，頁957。
鄒聞望	《留溪外傳》，卷5，頁13。
趙炳龍(1617-97)	《明季滇南遺民錄》，卷上，在《彙輯》，頁996-7。
鄭重	《明季滇南遺民錄》，卷上，在《彙輯》，頁1071。
鄭燾	《崑新兩縣續修合志》，卷29，頁23。
蕭俊文	《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷3，在《彙輯》，頁1097。
戴笠	《皇明遺民傳》，卷4，在《彙輯》，頁1167。 諸福坤，〈高士戴耘野先生祠堂記〉，《碑傳集補》，卷36，頁1469。
薛剛生	吳其敏，《文史劄記》(香港：中華書局，1976)，頁85。
謝遴	朱彝尊，《靜志居詩話》(明代傳記叢刊本)，卷19，頁15。

謝鏜	《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷1，在《彙輯》，頁700。
韓程愈	《清詩紀事》，頁896。
魏嘗(1617-90)	《皇明遺民傳》，卷6，在《彙輯》，頁1181。
羅萬傑	《勝朝粵東遺民錄》，卷4，在《彙輯》，頁1200-1。
顧樞(1602-68)	《國朝耆獻類徵初編》，卷395，頁13。 《留溪外傳》，卷4，頁12。
顧麟士	黃宗羲，〈顧麟士先生墓誌銘〉，《黃宗羲全集》冊十，頁418。

學術與國家
——北伐前後「國學」的學科定位與認同危機

羅志田
四川大學歷史系教授

20世紀20年代後期，當一度風靡的整理國故開始走向衰歇之時，「國學」本身的學科定位或學術認同也產生了問題。有的學者試圖用「國故學」來取代「國學」，有人根本主張「國學」不是「學」。實際上，從19世紀末的甲午戰爭到1945年抗戰結束，對於久處外患壓迫下的中國士人來說，20世紀20年代可能是中外「國家」實體競爭最爲淡化的時段。此時與清季的最大區別是「學術」與「國家」的疏離：對強調「國無學則不立」的清季士人來說，國學既不能「無用」，也不能不是「國粹」；但對提倡「科學無國界」的新文化人來說，「學術」與「國家」可以無關，至少關係不密切[1]。正是在這樣一種立場之上，「國學」本身成爲可以比以前遠更輕鬆地進行討論的題目。

拘束的減少往往伴生著隨意性的增加，朱熹曾說：「屈原之賦，不

---

1 學術超越的觀念在新文化運動前期甚得提倡，但顯然受到五四學生運動的有力衝擊；或正因此，在20年代初的「科學與人生觀之爭」中，學術超越的觀念反得到較前更有力的提倡，這一趨勢要到「九一八」之後才有較大的改變，詳另文。

甚怨君，卻被後人講壞」。章學誠以爲，此語「最爲知古人心」[2]。與清季相類，民初反對和支持國學者多少都有從自己「成心」出發而將其「講好」或「講壞」的傾向，後者尤甚；不同的是，清季人較多是無意中受到「成心」的影響，未必出自立言者有意識的動機；民初人則更明顯地是在意識層面爲了某種目的將國學「講壞」。胡適等人對整理國故態度的轉變即是一例，但其轉變態度的主要原因又是認爲「國學」妨礙了「中國」這一國家實體的發展，即鄭振鐸擔心的會「有阻礙於中國民族的進步與發展」、特別是阻礙「中國國力及文化的發展」，無意中仍回到「國家」立場之上[3]。

結果，在較少受到外患直接壓迫的情形之下，一度疏離的「學術」與「國家」再次凸顯出其緊密的關聯[4]，體現了民初對清季的思想繼承。或者說，在意識層面力圖區分「學術」與「國家」的民初趨新學者在下意識層面仍相當注重「學術」與「國家」的關聯。本文即將「國學」的學科定位或學術認同的困境置於這一語境之中進行考察，同時也關注趨新學人在意識層面與下意識層面之間的此種心態緊張。

引言：國學與國故學

晚清中西學戰的結果是中學已被認爲「無用」，在一定程度上或可以說，國粹、國學、國故等詞匯的大量引入思想言說之中，恐怕就因爲

2 章學誠，〈史考摘錄〉，收入倉修良編，《文史通義新編》(上海古籍書店，1993年)，頁339。

3 鄭振鐸，〈且慢談所謂「國學」〉，《小說月報》，20卷1號(1929年1月)，頁12。詳細的討論參見羅志田〈新舊能否兩立？二十年代《小說月報》對於整理國故的態度轉變〉，《歷史研究》，2001年3期；〈從治病到打鬼：整理國故運動的一條內在理路〉，《中國學術》，2001年2期。

4 「學術」與「國家」的關聯究竟在多大程度上是實際存在的，多大程度上是人們認知中的，不是簡單說得清楚，本文相對側重後者。

「中學」已經失去吸引力和競爭力，尤其「國學」明顯是「中學」的近義詞。當章太炎鼓吹「以國粹激動種姓」時，他(以及主張以歷史激發愛國心的梁啓超等)有意無意間不過是換一個標籤而試圖將在時人思想言說中已經邊緣化的「中學」拉回到中心來；但正由於國粹與中學的接近，這一努力的成就有限，或可說基本是不成功的。認爲中國沒有國粹、只有「國渣」的觀念在清季已出現，到民初更越來越得到強調。

對已經邊緣化並被「證明」無用的中學來說，即使是一個中立的態度也已相當親切。其實多數中國讀書人的民族主義情緒一直動蕩於胸中，「國粹」當初確曾較有吸引力，在20世紀最初幾年一度風靡；惟不久即被其主要的倡導者棄用。這部分也因爲他們本不認爲中國傳統一切皆「粹」，而提倡將傳統區分對待，曾重建出別於「君學」的「國學」。且其在試圖區別於日本「國粹主義」之時已隱約覺察到「國粹」這一新名詞有些問題，也在探索可否以其他更恰當的方式來表述「國粹」[5]。

章太炎在1906年曾提倡「以國粹激動種姓」，而在1908年的〈規新世紀〉一文中已將國粹、國學和國故三詞並用，那時基本是作爲互換的同義詞而避免文字的重複；但一年多後他將其重要著作命名爲《國故論衡》時，則意味著在意識層面對「國粹」的正式棄用，且多少隱含著「反戈一擊」之意：「國故」當然比「國粹」更中性，而「論衡」則義本王充，明顯有商榷批評之意[6]。換言之，即使這中性的「國故」也是可以且應該商榷批評的。

不過，對「國故」這一略偏消極的隱含之義也不能太過強調，就在出版《國故論衡》的1910年，太炎又與其弟子錢玄同等發行了面向大眾

5 參見羅志田，〈溫故知新：清季包容歐化的國粹觀〉，《中華文史論叢》第66輯(2001年9月)。

6 錢穆已注意及此，參見其《現代中國學術論衡》(岳麓書社，1986)，頁1。

的《教育今語雜誌》，其宗旨便明確首列「保存國故」[7]。以「保存國故」取代稍早流行的「保存國粹」，似提示著對「國故」之中性意義的強調雖已到意識層面，然基本仍在較隨意地替換使用，尚未嚴格地界定和推敲；蓋「保存國粹」要「粹」者乃保存，而「保存國故」則可以是未必「粹」者也要保存，實隱喻著凡國之故皆當保存，倒更像張之洞提倡的存古取向，對即使「不盡適用者，亦必存而傳之，斷不肯聽其澌滅」[8]。

傅斯年在1928年即明言，「國故本來即是國粹，不過說來客氣一點兒；而所謂國學院也恐怕是一個改良的存古學堂」[9]。他到1940年更總結說：「『國學』一詞，本與國醫同其不通。清季有所謂存古學堂，本是呫嗶咿唔之化身，不待論矣。以後章太炎談國故，似勝於前矣。然國故一詞，本為習用，即國朝之掌故也。乃太炎盡改其舊義，大無謂也。清末民初，人以國學二字為不妥，遂用國故；自國學專修館之勢力膨脹，此名詞更通行，然此館者，私塾之放大也。」[10]

無論如何，相對中性的「國故」在民初得到採用，部分即因為「國粹」不能得到比較廣泛的認可。傅斯年自已在1919年的態度便稍緩和，

7 錢玄同，〈刊行《教育今語雜誌》之緣起〉，《錢玄同文集》，第2卷(中國人民大學出版社，1999)，頁312。

8 不過這也可能是章太炎和「宗旨」的實際撰寫者錢玄同的觀念差異，錢氏或真存此見，他在1908年9月30日的日記中說：「凡文字、言語、冠裳、衣服，皆一國之表旗，我國古來已盡臻美善，無以復加，今日只宜奉行」。他當時正主張「存古」，並確實將「存古」界定為保存那些因時勢不同而「不適宜於今者」，以使後人得以「追想其祖宗創造之豐功偉烈」。轉引自楊天石，〈振興中國文化的曲折尋求——論辛亥前後至「五四」時期的錢玄同〉，中國社會科學研究院科研局等編，《五四運動與中國文化建設》(社會科學文獻出版社，1989)，下冊，頁993-994。

9 傅斯年，〈歷史語言研究所工作之旨趣〉，收入其《史料論略及其他》(遼寧教育出版社，1997)，頁46。

10 傅斯年致朱家驊〔抄件〕(1940年7月8日)，中央研究院史語所「傅斯年檔案」，承杜正勝所長惠允使用。

他那時以爲「國粹不成一個名詞(請問國而且粹的有幾)，實在不如國故妥協。至於保存國粹，尤其可笑。凡是一件事物，講到了保存兩字，就把往博物院去的命運和盤托出了。我們若真要做古人的肖子，也當創造國粹(就是我們自己發明點新事物)，不當保存國粹。天地間事，不進就退，沒有可以保存得住的。」[11] 問題在於，即使這更「妥協」的「國故」，在很大程度上仍不過是一個涵蓋寬泛的虛懸名號而已，使用這一名詞的各類人等其實未必具有共識。

毛子水當時就置疑道，「什麼是國故呢？我們倘若把這個問題問起那些講國故的人，所得的回答恐怕沒有相同的。有些必定說國故就是『三綱五常』；有些必定說國故就是『四書五經』；有些必定說『學海堂經解』是國故；更有些必把『駢體文鈔』『古文辭類纂』『鐘鼎款識』……等東西當作國故。」可知「國故這個名詞，沒有很清楚很一定的意義」。他根據章太炎《國故論衡》的內容，以爲「國故就是中國古代的學術思想」；並增加章氏此書未專門論及的「歷史」，提出「國故就是中國古代的學術思想和中國民族過去的歷史」。若「不把學術史從民族的歷史裡分出來，我們簡直可以用『中國過去歷史的材料』代替國故這個名詞」[12]。

他特別解釋「國故的大部分是中國民族過去的歷史的材料」一點說：「國故的大部分，實在就是中國民族過去的歷史。但是從前人所做的從前人的歷史，我們現在不能用他；因爲現在人的歷史的眼光，十分之八九不應當和從前人的相同，所以我們現在的歷史，大部分都應當從我們自己的歷史的眼光新做出來，方能合用。因此，我們把國故的這一大部分，不看作中國民族過去的歷史，看作中國民族過去的歷史的材

11 傅斯年，〈毛子水《國故和科學的精神》附識〉，《新潮》，1卷5號(1919年5月1日)(上海書店1986年影印本)，頁745。

12 本段與下段，毛子水，〈國故和科學的精神〉，《新潮》，1卷5號，頁731、733-735、743。

料。」這裡所說的「歷史」，主要是「歷史學」的意思；因前人眼光不同而做出的歷史便可以「不看作歷史」，正是清季中國「無史」論的「現代表述」。惟「國故」既然是歷史的材料，則治此材料的「國故學」自然便成爲歷史學了。

幾年後胡適整合並進一步系統闡發傅斯年和毛子水的觀念說，「『國學』在我們的心眼裡，只是『國故學』的縮寫。中國的一切過去的文化歷史，都是我們的『國故』；研究這一切過去的歷史文化的學問，就是『國故學』，省稱爲『國學』。『國故』這個名詞，最爲妥當；因爲他是一個中立的名詞，不含褒貶的意義。『國故』包含『國粹』；但他又包含『國渣』。我們若不了解『國渣』，如何懂得『國粹』？」可知胡適對「國故」這一詞匯的選擇正因爲它不含褒貶的中立性。他進而明確提出「要擴充國學的領域，包括上下三四千年的過去文化，打破一切的門戶成見：拿歷史的眼光來整統一切」[13]。

胡適並對國故學這一「領域」做出了更具體的界定：「國故學包括一切過去的文化歷史。歷史是多方面的：單記朝代興亡，固不是歷史；單有一宗一派，也不成歷史。過去種種，上自思想學術之大，下至一個字、一支山歌之細，都是歷史，都屬於國學研究的範圍。」而「國學的使命是要大家懂得中國的過去的文化史；國學的方法是要用歷史的眼光來整理一切過去文化的歷史；國學的目的是要做成中國文化史」。他具體列出「中國文化史」的系統則包括民族、語言文字、經濟、政治、國際交通、思想學術、宗教、文藝、風俗、制度十種史。換言之，「國學」就是系統的中國文化史。

---

13 本段與下段，胡適，〈《國學季刊》發刊宣言〉，《胡適文存二集》(亞東圖書館，1924)，卷一，頁11、14、20-21。胡適在〈宣言〉中對國學所下的定義在一定程度上代表了北大研究所國學門同仁的看法，參見逯耀東，〈傅斯年與《歷史語言研究所集刊》〉，《國立台灣大學歷史學報》，第20期(1996年11月)，頁243-244；陳以愛，《中國現代學術研究機構的興起——以北京大學研究所國學門為中心的探討(1922-1927)》(台北政治大學，1999)，頁226-245。

這一關於「國故學」界定雖明顯可見毛子水的影響，其傾向性卻相當不同：毛氏在討論「材料」時帶有明顯的不屑意味，而胡適在強調「不含褒貶」的基礎上又提出「國學的使命」，顯然相當肯定其存在的價值[14]。這不久即引起青年讀書人的置疑，鄭伯奇以為：「本來『國學』二字是很籠統的名辭，而國學運動云云更令人不易理解。是一種勸人研究古籍的運動呢？還是勸人研究一切中國的——不論古今新陳，只要是中國的——文化、思想、學術、文學歷史、地理、政治、經濟，乃至中國的國民性、各地方的風俗習慣的一種運動呢？」兩者的範圍廣狹不一，尤其前者「頂好不過勸人用新眼光讀古書罷了」[15]。鄭氏的確看出了以「國學」代「國故學」的問題：有沒有「故」的存在，可以有相當大的差異。

前引毛子水所言說明，五四運動前後時人對「國故」的概念原乏共識。這一現象到北伐前仍無大的變化，曹聚仁發現：「吾人一提及『國故』，則龐雜紛沓之觀念交集於前。若就各觀念而一一考訂之，則一切觀念皆浮泛空虛，楞然無所有焉。此燁然於外而羌無其物之『國故』，即今日國內一般守舊學者所以支撐門面之工具，亦即偏激者流所等之於『抽鴉片裹小腳』者也。」儘管「國故」已如此「臃腫不中繩墨」，當時不少人援用國故之名，「從未計及其實；其意蓋以為『國故』之名，盡人而喻之」[16]。

曹氏觀察到：「『國故』、『國學』、『中學』、『古學』、『國

---

14 按此時胡適正大力提倡「整理國故」，並希望青年參與；但幾年後他又改變了態度，轉而主張青年應多從事自然科學，不必走整理國故這條「死路」，說詳羅志田〈新舊能否兩立？二十年代《小說月報》對於整理國故的態度轉變〉，《歷史研究》2001年3期；〈從治病到打鬼：整理國故運動的一條內在理路〉，《中國學術》，2001年2期。

15 鄭伯奇，〈國民文學論(下)〉，《創造周報》，35號(1924年1月6日)，頁6。

16 本段與下三段，曹聚仁，〈國故學之意義與價值〉、〈春雷初動中之國故學〉(1925年12月)，許嘯天輯，《國故學討論集》(以下逕引書名)(上海書店影印群學社，1927)，第1集，頁50-51、60-61、90-91、73-74。

粹』、『國故學』等歧異名詞，在近頃學術界已成一異文互訓之慣例；筆之於著作，見之於制度，習焉相望，莫知其非。」他以爲，「『國粹』一名，當別爲解釋，與他名相去甚遠。『國學』、『中國〔學〕』、『古學』三者，與『國故』、『國故學』各不相應。」蓋「『國故』者，五千年間中華民族以文字表達之結晶思想也」；而國故學與中國文化也不能等同，文化指全體，國故僅指以文字表現於紙片者。

與鄭伯奇相類，曹聚仁也認爲，胡適說國學是國故學的縮寫，「斯言妄也。胡氏之說，殆遷就俗稱而爲之曲解耳。抑知『國故』二字之重心在『故』；於『故』，乃知所研究之對象爲過去文化思想之僵石、乃知此研究之對象已考終於『五四運動』之際、乃知此研究之對象與化學室之標本同其狀態」。如果「去『故』而留『國』，則如呼『西瓜』之爲『西』、『太陽』之爲『太』，聞者必茫然不知所云。故愚以爲國故學必當稱爲『國故學』，決無可省之理」。

當時一些人以國學爲中國學術，遂「以國故學爲中國學術史之別名」，也不成立。蓋「國故與中國學術史之內容與範圍非完全相同」，國故僅限於中華民族，「而中國學術史則凡在中國地域所曾有之學術，皆所必載」；且「國故以『五四運動』爲終點，後乎此皆無與於斯學；中國學術史則與時間以俱存，可延長至無限」。曹氏以爲，「自有文字以至五四運動，可成爲一大段落；五四運動以後，舊有結晶思想皆完全崩壞」，中國已進入新的階段。國故學所研究的，只是五四運動以前這一大段落。

而清華學生梁實秋則可以接受「國學」這一名詞，他論「國學的性質」說：「國學便是一國獨自形成的學問，國學便是所以別於舶來的學問的一個名詞」。這樣的「國學」，實際就是晚清人所說的「中學」。對此梁氏其實也有些保留，蓋他以爲「學問這個東西，是不分國界的」；他也承認「中國在未開海禁以前，所有經天緯地的聖經賢傳、禍

國殃民的邪說異端，大半是些本國的土產」。現在雖然「杜威羅素的影響也似乎不在孔孟以下，然而我們暫且撇開古今中外的學問的是非善惡的問題不論，爲命名清晰起見，把本國土產的學問叫做國學，這卻沒有什麼不可以」[17]。

不論「國學」是否「國故學」的縮寫，當時許多人的確將其替換使用。東南大學的《史地學報》在介紹北大《國學季刊》時說，「國學之爲名，本難確定其義。在世界地位言之，即中國學。分析爲言，則中國原有學術，本可分隸各種學科，惟故籍浩博，多須爲大規模之整理；而整理之業，尤以歷史爲重要；而研究之中，莫不須用歷史的眼光」[18]。該刊關於國學的界定與梁實秋比較接近，並特別看出「整理國故」與史學的緊密關聯；但更重要的是，《史地學報》提出了「中國原有學術」分隸「各種學科」這一直接關係到「國學」認同的關鍵問題。這裡的「各種學科」當然指的是西學意義上的「學科」，而「中國原有學術」必須經過「大規模之整理」才有可能「分隸」其下[19]。

從清季興辦學堂開始，西方學科分類逐漸在中國教育體系中確立，但這也有一個過程。在民初新舊學科分類俱存的語境下，中國固有的主流學術，比如「經學」，怎樣融入胡適所謂的「中國文化史」？有些學科如「中國文學」(雖然概念尙在界定之中)已大致取得依西洋分類的學科資格，從事此類研究者是否願意承認他們是在研究「史學」的一種？那些尙未容納在胡適「中國文化史」範圍內的「中國原有學術」又是不是「國學」呢？很明顯，「國學」也好，「國故學」也好，均尙未能確立自身的學術典範，其在很大程度上仍不過是一個涵蓋寬泛的虛懸名

17 梁實秋，〈灰色的書目〉，《晨報副刊》(人民出版社，1981年影印本)，1923年10月15日，1版。

18 《史地學報》，2卷4號(1923)，頁139。

19 按後來不少學人正如此主張，但這樣一來，經整理而「分隸各種學科」之後，不論國學還是國故學都不復有存在的必要，對此各學者卻無共識，詳後。

號，且與新舊中西的學科分類都有所衝突[20]。

西方學術分類與國學的學科定位

在蒙文通看來，既然傳統中國學術的主流是經學，則國學幾乎就是經學的同義詞。他在1922年著〈近二十年來漢學之平議〉(後修改更名爲〈經學導言〉)說：「近二十年間漢學的派別很多，可說是清朝一代的縮影，就說他是中國幾千年學術的縮影亦無不可。一部分是陳蘭甫、桂文燦的餘波，是主張漢宋兼治的；一部分是不辨別今古的，卻還有乾嘉風流，這兩派都是前時代的餘韻，也不甚惹人注意。最風行一世的，前十年是今文派，後十年便是古文派。什麼教科書、新聞紙，一說到國學，便出不得這兩派的範圍。兩派的領袖，今文家便是廣東的康先生，古文家便是浙江的章先生。二十年間，只是他們的兩家新陳代謝，爭辯不休，他們的爭議便占了漢學的大部分了[21]。這裡的「二十年來」指二十世紀的前二十年，則民初許多人所說的「國學」仍不過就是清代的「漢學」，其典範也還不出康有爲和章太炎所代表的今、古文經學。

或許正是針對蒙文通觀察到的現象，林玉堂後來便認爲「國學」乃是一個與傳統「經學」對立的正面新詞匯。他認爲「國學須脫離經學而獨立」，以形成其所謂「科學的國學」。林氏提出，「今日的人治經須與古人不同，就不必使六經爲我們的注腳，卻須以六經爲國學的注腳。清代學雖有離經說子、別成一家的人，但他獨立的動作還是有限的，敢

20 劉龍心已詳細探討了當時國學、史學與學術分科的問題，參其〈學科體制與近代中國史學的建立〉，收入羅志田主編，《20世紀的中國：學術與社會(史學卷)》(山東人民出版社，2001)，頁544-580。我與她看法相近處不再申論，而不甚相同處，除本文外，也可參考拙文〈走向國學與史學的「賽先生」〉，《近代史研究》，2000年3期。

21 蒙文通，〈經學導言〉，《經史抉原》(《蒙文通文集》第3卷)(巴蜀書社，1995)，頁12。

暗謀而不敢明叛」。今日就須「拿國學研究我國各種文化現象」爲目的，而「國學的規模可因科學的眼光而改造」。以前的經學家提不出什麼問題，如胡適所列的各種「文化史」子目「都是前人所夢想不到的，而由研究西洋政治思想宗教文藝的人看他，都是急待考查的」[22]。

對劉復來說，這樣的國學已是「新國學」。他在1925年說，「我們只須一看北京大學研究所國學門中所做的工夫，可以斷定此後的中國國學界必定能另闢一新天地：即使是一時還不能希望得到多大的成績，總至少能開出許許多多古人所夢想不到的好法門」。他界定說，「我們『新國學』的目的，乃是要依據了事實，就中國全民族各方面加以精詳的觀察與推斷，而找出個五千年來文明進化的總端與分緒來」[23]。這一「新國學」的提法因日本人的認可而強化，留日的何思敬從東洋文庫主任石田幹之助那裡聽說「中國有新國學之發生」，遂到東洋文庫去讀《國學門周刊》，「從中發現了顧頡剛先生的一九二六年的〈始刊詞〉及另外數篇，後來又見到他的〈孟姜女研究〉前篇，忽然我的心境好像來了一陣暴風，覺得中國學術界起了革命」[24]。

本來清季劉師培、鄧實等人所重建的「國學」不論在思想涵義還是學術涵義上都已是一種「新國學」[25]；故北大國學門所謂的「新國學」，實際可以說是一種「新新國學」了。不過這一未能確立自身學術典範的「新國學」雖然意在標新，仍與舊學有著割不斷的聯繫。正如胡適注意到的，在以北大爲中心的整理國故運動開始之前，已有類似的「運動」出現：古學界青黃不接造成的學術寂寞使許多人產生古學將要

22 林玉堂，〈科學與經書〉，《晨報五周年紀念增刊》(附在影印《晨報副刊》第5冊)，1923年12月1日，頁23。

23 劉復，〈敦煌掇瑣敘目〉，《北京大學研究所國學門周刊》，1：3(1925年10月28日)，頁6。

24 何思敬，〈讀妙峰山進香專號〉，《民俗》，第4期(1928年4月11日)，頁1。

25 關於思想涵義方面，參見羅志田〈清季保存國粹的朝野努力及其觀念異同〉，《近代史研究》，2001年2期。

淪亡的悲觀，結果「很自然的發出一種沒氣力的反動的運動來」，包括夢想孔教復興者、試圖通過保存古文古詩以達到古學保存者、甚至靜坐扶乩者。胡適宣布，「在我們看起來，這些反動都只是舊式學者破產的鐵證」；相反，「國學的將來，定能遠勝國學的過去」[26]。很明顯，胡適正試圖用「國學」這一認同來區別於破產的「古學」，並使整理國故運動區別於先已存在的挽救古學那「沒氣力的運動」。然前引蒙文通的觀察已提示了當時一般人的認知仍是經學與國學不分，而胡適自己在其〈《國學季刊》發刊宣言〉中，不僅在綜述清代「古學」時數次使用「經學」一詞，在論及將來意義的「整治國故」時，也無意中說出「這還是專爲經學、哲學說法；在文學的方面，也有同樣的需要」這樣的話。吳文祺立刻發現這裡含有新舊學術分科的衝突，指出「舊時經史子集的分類，實在是很可笑的；但這篇宣言卻於哲學文學……的名稱之外，別有所謂『經學』的名稱的存在」[27]。的確，若新「國學」裡仍有「經學」一科，又怎樣區分於舊式的「古學」呢？

故在吳文祺看來，胡適的〈宣言〉雖「可算是一篇國故學上的空前的偉論」，卻也有不足；且其「既不說明整理國故的必要與價值，更不說明國故的性質，而只定了許多整理國故的方法」。他進而說，「從來沒有人替國故學下過定義，我且來替它下一個定義吧：用分析、綜合、比較種種方法，去整理中國的國故的學問，叫做國故學」。吳氏主張，「中國過去的一切文化歷史，便是中國的國故」；而「整理國故這種學門，就叫做國故學；國故是材料，國故學是一種科學」。這其實基本不出胡適〈宣言〉所論，但其竟然可以說「從來沒有人替國故學下過定義」，當時少年新進那種目中無人、橫掃一切的氣概，於此可見一

---

26 胡適，〈《國學季刊》發刊宣言〉，《胡適文存二集》，卷1，頁1-2。

27 本段與下四段，吳文祺，〈重新估定國故學之價值〉（1924年2月），《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁33-35、38-39、41-44、49。

斑[28]。不過他看出胡適所言主要側重「方法」，確有眼力。與鄭伯奇、曹聚仁一樣，吳氏也不同意國故學就是國學(吳文之撰寫在鄭後曹前)。他說：「老先生們以駢文、古文、詩詞、歌賦、對聯……等爲國學，聽見人家談整理國故，他們便得意洋洋地大唱其國學(？)復活的凱旋歌；而一般把學術看作時髦的裝飾品的新先生們，也在『和老先生們同一的國學觀念』之下，大聲疾呼地來反對國學。」其實，「現在有許多人以抱殘守缺爲保存國粹，或是詆整理國故爲迷戀骸骨，完全是由於缺乏歷史進化觀念的緣故」；而歷史進化觀念的缺乏則因爲「中國枉有數千年的文化，但是到現在還沒有一部完全的歷史」。研究國故則一方面可使人們知道歷史上一切制度學說是在不斷進化的，同時又是完成一部完整歷史的「重要工作」。

吳文祺提出，「國故學是超乎文學、哲學……之外的一種科學，也是一種很重要的人人所必備的常識」。換言之，國故學是一個「總名」，包括考訂學、文字學、校勘學和訓詁學；「嚴格講來，只有以上這幾種學問，才是純粹的國故學」。故「應用國故學所整理出來的材料，只可謂之國故學的結果，決不可認爲國故學的本身。我們假使所整理的是哲學，那末當然歸入哲學的範圍；文學，文學的範圍；政治學，政治學的範圍；經濟學，經濟學的範圍」。換言之，國故學不過是研究中國的文學、哲學、經濟學、政治學等都要「借重」的一種特殊基礎學科。這一觀點與前引《史地學報》關於「中國原有學術須經大規模之整理始可分隸各種學科」的主張非常相近，惟「近人往往不明白國故學的性質，於是不管三七二十一，把中國的文學、哲學……都硬撳到國學這個名詞裡去」。

28 按吳文祺比胡適小十歲，撰此文時不過二十出頭。當時青年讀書人大約也不太講究今日所謂「學術規範」，吳氏自己及本文多次引用的曹聚仁論「國故學」的見解，多半都是發揮或系統化毛子水先已提出的觀念，然皆不提及借鑑了毛氏的主張。

這是一個相當重要的見解，國故學雖是一個「總名」，其所包括的卻都是經過新式劃分的傳統中國學問(將考訂、文字、校勘和訓詁視爲獨立的「學」，顯然是新眼光的產物)；所以，國故學雖與現代西方學術分類中的許多學科都有聯繫，卻並非包含各種西式學門的「總名」。吳文祺與胡適的重要區別在於，胡適的整理國故用「文化史」的名目暗中將傳統中國學術直接轉換成現代西式學術，而吳氏則認爲整理國故只是將傳統中國學術轉換成現代西式學術進程中一個必須「借重」的過渡環節，只是在此意義上才有所謂國故學，此後便是(世界通行的)的文學、哲學、經濟學和政治學這些類別了。如果據今日已具「世界性」的西式學術分類看，吳文祺的觀念似乎相對更「合理」，因爲許多「國故」的確不是「文化史」所能涵蓋的。

然而這裡也含有隱憂：吳氏已說「國故學是一種科學」，這樣一種無法納入現代西式學術分類的「科學」又是怎樣的「科學」呢？他自己的解釋是：「國故學的性質，很像數學。數學一方面是訓練思想的最好的方法，一方面又是各種科學的基礎。國故學在一方面固然是研究中國的哲學、文學……的基本學問，在別一方面，研究國故學的人，也可以藉此成我國人所最缺乏的重徵求是的科學精神。」這基本是轉述毛子水的見解[29]，但數學爲「各種科學的基礎」似並不限於西方，而國故學則只是研究中國「哲學、文學……」的基礎，兩者的可比性實有限；且國故學是否能具有數學在西方科學系統中的地位，恐怕還難以形成共識。進一步的問題是，國故經整理而納入「各種科學」之後，這一「基礎」還有存在的必要嗎？

曹聚仁注意到吳氏的看法，他說，有人「以爲國故學乃暫名：國故之資料，未完全整理以前，其名尚可存在；或以爲國故學乃統攝名，多〔分？〕之則爲文學、史學、哲學……等等，合之即爲一『國故學』。國

29 毛子水，〈國故和科學的精神〉，《新潮》，1卷5號，頁736。

故學之本身，無特殊之本質可言也」。如果這樣，「國故一經整理，則分家之勢即成。他日由整理國故而組成之哲學、教育學、人生哲學、政治學、文學、經濟學、史學、自然科學……必自成一系統而與所謂國故者完全脫離」[30]。這並非假設，許嘯天便正式提出，要使國故成爲學問，就需要「後代的學者肯用一番苦功」從「一個囫圇的國故學」中一樣一樣地整理出「政治學、政治史、社會學、社會史、文學、文學史、哲學、哲學史、以及一切工業，農業、數理、格物」，並一一「歸併在全世界的學術裡，把這虛無縹緲學術界上大恥辱的國故學名詞取消」[31]。

問題在於，「待各學完全獨立以後，則所謂『國故』者，是否尚有存在之餘地？所謂國故學者，何所憑藉而組成爲『學』？」曹聚仁以爲國故學仍有其存在價值，其憑藉即「國故學之獨立性」。他說，由於「國故中所含蘊之中華民族精神，與他民族完全異其趨向」，故「國故雖可整理之以歸納於各學術系統之下，而與他文化系統下之學術相較，仍有其特點」。即使各學分立，將來「吾人欲知此大民族在此長期中所產生之特殊思想，必於此中窺其消息」[32]。這一見解與胡適當時強調的「歷史的眼光」相通，只要注重人與事本身的發展歷史，自然產生某種獨特性，這大概也是後來「區域研究」在西方興起的一個理論基礎。

不過，這種「獨立性」與五四人最欣賞也最提倡的「世界性」相當對立，且很可能降低其「科學性」。曹聚仁再次援用了胡適的思路，他論證國故學的「科學性」說：「國故學者，記載此思想之生滅，分析此思想之性質，羅列此思想之表形式，考察此思想之因果關係，以合理的、系統的、組織的方式述說之者也。簡言之，國故學者以『國故』爲研究之對象，而以科學方法處理之，使成爲一科學也。」所謂合理，即「客觀性之

30 曹聚仁，〈國故學之意義與價值〉，《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁74。

31 許嘯天，《國故學討論集・新序》，第1集，頁7。

32 本段與下段，曹聚仁，〈國故學之意義與價值〉，《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁74-75、64、68-69、71-72。

存在」；所謂組織，即「以歸納方法求一斷案，以演繹方法合之群義」；所謂系統，即「或以問題為中心，或以時代為先後，或以宗派相連續，於凌亂無序之資料中，為之理一綱領也」。簡言之，「國故先經合理的敘述而蕪雜去，繼經組織的整理而合義顯，乃入之於系統而學乃成」。

這大致仍是胡適的取向，即某一「學」是否為「科學」主要視其運用什麼方法怎樣「成學」，而不特別考慮其是否合於現代西方的學科分類。胡適的朋友陳源卻不能同意這一觀點，他認為，「現在的國故學者十九還不配去整理國故。他們大家打的旗幟是運用『科學方法』，可是什麼是科學方法？離開了科學本身，那所說的『科學方法』究竟是什麼呢？一個人不懂得什麼是科學，他又怎樣的能用科學方法呢」？國故既然是「中國的一切過去的文化歷史」，則整理的工作「是不是一個僅能讀幾本線裝書的人，挾了『科學方法』所能夠勝任的」？他主張應「讓經濟學者去治經濟史，政治學者去治政治史，宗教學者去治宗教史」[33]。很明顯，陳源並不承認有什麼超越於西方現代學術分類的抽象「科學方法」，實即根本不承認「國故學」為「科學」。

究竟怎樣才算「科學」，或國學與已通行於中國高等教育體系的西方學術分科怎樣銜接，的確是使當時學者困擾的問題。陳獨秀在1923年就提出，「國學是什麼，我們實在不太明白。當今所謂國學大家，胡適之所長是哲學史，章太炎所長是歷史和文字音韻學，羅叔蘊所長是金石考古學，王靜庵所長是文學。除這些學問外，我們實在不明白什麼是國學？」他認為，「國學」這一名詞，「就是再審訂一百年也未必能得到明確的觀念，因為『國學』本是含混糊塗不成一個名詞」[34]。這裡陳獨秀大致已按西方學術分類來認識國學，但在他的認知中只有章太炎一人

33 陳源為胡適的〈整理國故與打鬼〉寫的〈西瀅跋語〉，《胡適文存三集》(亞東圖書館，1930)，卷2，頁217-218。

34 陳獨秀，〈國學〉，《陳獨秀著作選》(上海人民出版社，1993)，第2卷，頁516-517。

長於歷史，王國維所長仍是文學；而魯迅在1922年已經注意到王國維爲《流沙墜簡》寫的長序，認爲「要談國學，他才可以算一個研究國學的人物」[35]。兩人都認可王國維所治爲「國學」，然而其在西來的學術分類中究屬何學，卻缺乏共識。

1925年清華學校設立研究院，年初制定的〈研究院章程〉規定，「先設國學一科，其內容約爲中國語言、歷史、文學、哲學等」。具體的研究對象，則包括中國經籍、近世所出古代史料、以及「其他人事方面，如歷代生活之情狀，言語之變遷，風俗之沿革，道德、政治、宗教、學藝之盛衰；自然方面，如川河之遷徙、動植物名實」等[36]。這抽象的分科和具體的研究對象顯然是有差距的，如「自然方面」的內容便不太容易納入前面列舉的學科。同年9月，研究院主任吳宓又說，「茲所謂國學者，乃指中國學術文化之全體而言。而研究之道，尤注重正確精密之方法(即時人所謂科學方法)」[37]。前後定義也不甚同，前者是在「國學」之下按照西學分科，後者則對分科態度含糊[38]。

北大國學門的顧頡剛嘗試解決這一問題說：「所謂科學，並不在它的本質，而在它的方法。它的本質乃是科學的材料」。科學的材料無所不包，自然也包括「中國歷史的材料。所以國學是科學中的一部分(如其是用了科學方法而作研究)，而不是可與科學對立的東西」。由於科學的「純粹客觀性」，它既「是超國界的」，也是超時代的(即「不受制於時代的古今」)。這樣，「在我們的眼光裡，只見到各個的古物、

---

35 魯迅，〈不懂的音譯〉，《魯迅全集》(人民文學出版社，1982)，第1卷，頁398。

36 〈研究院章程・緣起〉，清華大學校史研究室，《清華大學史料選編》，第1卷(清華大學出版社，1991)，頁375-376。

37 吳宓，〈清華開辦研究院之旨趣及經過〉，《清華大學史料選編》，第1卷，頁374。

38 不過後者有可能是因應校長曹雲祥在開學典禮上的講話，曹氏當時指出，研究院要「研究中國高深之經史哲學；其研究之法，可以利用科學方法，並參加中國考據之法」，以「尋出中國之國魂」(曹雲祥，〈開學詞〉(1925年)，《清華大學史料選編》，第1卷，頁263)。

史料，風俗物品和歌謠都是一件東西，這些東西都有它的來源，都有它的經歷，都有它的生存的壽命；這些來源、經歷、和生存的壽命都是我們可以著手研究的」[39]。各種「東西」都成為科學研究的「材料」後，「科學」便使它們平等，惟其在科學面前的「平等」實際也掩蓋了各自的「來源、經歷、和生存的壽命」，後者乃是曹聚仁所說的「獨立性」之基礎。既然「科學」是超越的和普遍的，國學的存在價值就產生了問題，許多否定國學或反對研究國學的人恰以此為其立論的基礎(詳後)。

顧氏自己並不覺得這是個大問題，因為他本將國學定義為「中國的歷史，是歷史科學中的中國的一部分」。他進而說，北大國學門「並不是(也不能)要包辦國學的。我們需求於別種科學的專門人才之處真是非常的多」。如果各種科學都發達，「中國方面的各科的材料都有人去研究，那麼我們的範圍就可縮小，我們就可純粹研究狹義的歷史，不必用這模糊不清的『國學』二字做我們的標名，就可以老實寫做『中國歷史學門』了(要放大一點，可以稱『東方歷史』，或單稱『歷史』，都無不可)」。這似乎是說，由於研究中國材料的別種科學尚不發達，故「歷史科學中的中國部分」乃以「國學」為名暫時兼代其他有關中國的「科學」之職能，則「國學」仍是一個過渡性的名稱。

無論如何，顧頡剛希望能「不必用這模糊不清的『國學』二字做我們的標名」這一點提示著「模糊不清」的確是當時國學的明顯特徵。主張「國故學」是「科學」的曹聚仁正據此以否定「國學」的正當性，他說，「科學之研究，最忌含糊與武斷。而國學二字，即為含糊與武斷之象徵」。本來「各科學之命名，當合論理之規範。如天文學，吾知其研究之對象為天文；地質學，吾知其研究之對象為地質」。而「國學定名之初，非經長期之考慮，但見陳吾前者為降然之遺產，漫名之曰『國

39 本段與下段，顧頡剛，〈一九二六年始刊詞〉，《北京大學研究所國學門周刊》，2：13(1926年1月6日)，頁1-3、5、9-10。

學』而已(誇大狂自熱時，則名之曰國粹，以傲四夷)」。惟既以國學爲名，則「對象即爲『中國』，其勢必將取中國之疆域、山川、都邑、人口、物產爲資料；然按之事實，夫人而知其不若斯也。由斯可知國學之爲名，不但不足代表其對象，且使人因名而生誤會」。這樣的國學「但有一名足矣，實之存否不計也」[40]。不過，曹氏個人固可從學理上區分「國故學」與「國學」，在多數時人認知中，兩者基本是一回事。

蔡尙思稍後恰反曹氏之道而行之，他將國學界定爲：「國是一國，學是學術，國學便是一國的學術。其在中國，就叫做中國的學術。既然叫做中國的學術，那就無所不包了。既然無所不包，那就無所偏畸了。乃今之學者，或以國學爲單指中華民族之結晶思想(曹聚仁)，或以國學爲中國語言文字學(吳文祺)，還有以史學眼光去觀察一切的(如章學誠、章太炎等)，以及誤認國學爲單指國文(其人甚多不易枚舉)與中國文學的(海上一般大學多以中國文學系爲國學系)。」這些人「皆僅得其一體，而尙未得其大全。在吾卻始終以爲，中國的固有文化，都不能出此國學二字範圍外」[41]。蔡氏所言不無隨意處，如將章學誠也納入「今之學者」，其對吳文祺的主張顯係誤讀，尤其他將「學術」與「文化」替換使用，皆可議；然其意在強調國學之「大全」，的確與多數人的主張異趣。

而鄭振鐸又從這「大全」處看到了國學的問題，曾爲整理國故正名的鄭氏到北伐後已轉變態度，以爲「『國學』乃是包羅萬有而其實一無所有的一種中國特有的『學問』，『國學家』乃是無所不知而其實一無所知——除了古書的訓詁之外——的一種中國特有的專門學者」[42]。明明長於「古書訓詁」卻被認爲「一無所知」，實際是將「古書訓詁」排

40 曹聚仁，〈春雷初動中之國故學〉，《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁90、93。

41 蔡尙思，《中國學術大綱》(上海啓智書局，1931)，頁5，轉引自鍾少華，〈試論近代中國之「國學」研究〉，《學術研究》，1999年8期，頁30。

42 鄭振鐸，〈且慢談所謂「國學」〉，《小說月報》20卷1號，頁10。關於鄭振鐸曾經支持整理國故及其態度轉變，參見羅志田，〈新舊能否兩立？二十年代《小說月報》對於整理國故的態度轉變〉，《歷史研究》，2001年3期。

除在學術和「知識」之外。那時除了少數像胡適那樣鑽研過西方「考證學」的留學生外，很少有人知道「古書訓詁」不僅是「中國特有」，它也可以是西學的一部分；但其在通行的西學分類中的確較難定位，鄭振鐸或者便是據此得出國學「包羅萬有而其實一無所有」的結論。

在整理國故尚未風行之時，樊抗父曾主張「中國固有之學術」可「因世俗之名以名之」爲「舊學」[43]。但那時若真名爲「舊學」，恐怕就沒有多少人願意從事了；必以科學化的「國學」或「國故學」名之，方有吸引力[44]。整理國故的影響之一，便是各中學皆開設「國學」一課。時任中學教師的錢穆即因教學所需而於北伐前後編撰《國學概論》一書，他在〈弁言〉中指出：「國學一名，前既無承，將來亦恐不立，特爲一時代的名詞。其範圍所及，何者應列國學，何者則否，實難判別。」[45]

由於中西學科分類之間確有一些難以彌合的差異，而時人認知中新舊中西的對立和衝突使「調和」變得困難；且「國學」本身也有其內在的缺陷，從清季國粹學派開始就有排斥歷代學術主流而從邊緣重建「國學」系統的傾向(雖然其「國學」又以包容寬廣爲特色)[46]；但一個並非枝節的原因是其風行時間畢竟太短，「國學」或「國故學」終未能形成自身的學術典範，在學科認同上缺乏一個廣泛接受的界定。正是國學與西式學術分科未能成功銜接這一點，成爲當時及稍後一些人主張「國學」不成其爲「學」的立論基礎。

西方學科分類在中國教育體系中確立後，學者多據西學分類以言中學。且並非所謂「新派」人物始如此，在一般認知中應屬「舊」而不新的

---

43 抗父(樊少泉)，〈最近二十年間中國舊學之進步〉，《東方雜誌》19卷3號(1922年2月10日)，頁33。

44 參見羅志田，〈走向國學與史學的「賽先生」〉，《近代史研究》，2000年3期。

45 錢穆，《國學概論》(台北商務印書館，1963年影印1931年版)，頁1。錢穆立論之時，「國學」本身已由高潮轉向衰歇，鄭振鐸等人的態度轉變即是一證。

46 說詳羅志田，〈清季保存國粹的朝野努力及其觀念異同〉，《近代史研究》2001年2期。

柳詒徵於1923年即提出「非漢學非宋學」的口號，主張「論學必先正名」，明言「漢學宋學兩名詞，皆不成爲學術之名」。他說，「余並非有意非難此種學術，不過非難此種名詞，因此種學術自有其正確之名詞」；而所謂「正確名詞」，當「就其學術性質」而定。柳氏「綜合後世所謂漢學者之性質觀之，凡考究文字訓詁聲韻之類，皆屬於文字學；凡考究典章制度，以及古書之真僞、史書之體例者，皆屬於歷史學。故漢學者非他，文字學耳、歷史學耳」。而「所謂宋學，可以分爲倫理學、心理學」[47]。

很明顯，他心目中「就其學術性質」而定的「正確名詞」皆以當時學校中通行的西式學術分類爲依據。這也不僅是學術分科的問題，柳氏注意到，新式大學中學者多「各治數種科學，有治文字學者、有治歷史學者、有治倫理學者、有治心理學者，或以一兼他，或互爲主輔」，皆「無礙於爲學」。然而「講漢學講宋學者則不然，一若講漢學即不可講宋學，講宋學即不可講漢學，入主出奴，互有軒輊」。所以，不「正確」的舊名詞也妨礙學術本身的發展。他希望學生「認此等學術，即是學校中之某種某種學程，不必分別朝代、分別界限」(其實所謂「各治數種科學」者恐怕是先治名詞不「正確」也不重分類的漢學或宋學，待按西學分類計算才突然變成「數種」；若一開始便從西式學科入手，大概也是專治一學的更多)。

值得注意的是，這是通常認爲偏於「守舊」的東南大學和南京高師兩校的「國學研究會」組織的演講，相當能說明當日學院派的「國學」有多麼趨新。柳詒徵比較新舊名詞的差異說，如名爲漢學，則可能「使人誤認爲一代之學，若後世之所未有、世界之所絕無」；若改「名之爲文字學、歷史學，使人一聞而知其性質，且可貫通歷代，表明講學者之隨時進化」。這裡非常明顯地提示著一種希望有利於「世界」接受中國固有學術的隱衷。

雖然柳氏已盡量「面向世界」，無意中仍暴露出其對西學了解的不

47 本段與下三段，柳詒徵(講演，趙萬里、王漢記)，〈漢學與宋學〉，東南大學、南京高師國學研究會編《國學研究會演講錄》，第1集(上海商務印書館，1924)，頁84-90。本文承徐雁平君代為複製，謹此致謝。

足。他在演講中舉例說，「類如有人號稱英學或德學，人必笑之；若曰吾所研究者爲英國之文學或德國之哲學，方成一個名詞」。但更加趨新的許嘯天則指出，後者「亦有語病」[48]。對於主張科學無國界的新派來說，如果西式分類的學科皆爲「科學」，則必然是普世性的，沒有什麼某國的某學，稍後傅斯年正從此角度否定「國學」的正當性(詳後)。

如果說柳詒徵等人可以接受按西方學科分類的「國學」，許嘯天則不然，他認爲世界各國皆有其國故、有其歷史，問題是「這國故經史，是不是算一種學問」？答案是否定的：「倘然國故可以成功一種學術，那全地球上的各國，每一國都有他自己的國故；爲什麼卻不聽得有英國故學、法國故學、德國故學的名稱傳說呢？所以國故實在算不得是一種學問。」經史亦然，「倘然有人問我們，『你們中國有些什麼學問？』我簡直回答不出來。我若回答說：『我們中國有六藝之學、有經史之學、還有那諸子百家之學；』這是滑稽的答語，也是一句笑話。試問『所謂經史之學、諸子百家之學，是一個什麼學問？』我依舊是回答不出來。」[49]

他的結論是，「中國的有國故學三字發現，正是宣告我們中國學術界程度的淺薄、知識的破產，而是一個毫無學問的國家」。進而言之，「中國莫說沒有一種有系統的學問，可憐，連那學問的名詞也還不能成立！如今外面鬧的什麼國故學、國學、國粹學，這種不合邏輯的名詞，還是等於沒有名詞。」清季國粹學派就曾基於學要「有用」的觀念推導出中國「無學」的結論[50]，但許氏的「中國無學」論所據又不同；前已

---

48 許嘯天，《國故學討論集　新序》，第1集，頁4。

49 本段與下段，許嘯天，《國故學討論集・新序》，第1集，頁4-6(許序作於1927年1月，這些言論是其自引他編王船山集的序，作於1926年3月)。按許氏大致以當時通行於中國的西學分類為「學術」或「學問」的標準，其實西方當時和現在皆自有其「經學(the Classical Studies)」，被鄭振鐸排斥的「古書訓詁」正是其中一項重要內容。

50 參見羅志田，〈從無用的「中學」到開放的「國學」：清季國粹學派關於學術與國家關係的思考〉，《中華文史論叢》第65輯(2001年3月)。

述及，他是認爲中國固有學術皆與西方學科分類不合，若從前者中一一整理出後者，便可「把這虛無縹緲學術界上大恥辱的國故學名詞取消」。許嘯天的觀念後來爲許多人採納，尤其他提出英、法、德等西方國家均無「國故學」一點最爲人所樂道。

從學理上對「國學」最有力的挑戰來自北伐後期回國的傅斯年，傅氏大約是「整理國故」一詞的最初使用者，如前所述，他在新文化運動時尚覺「國故」比「國學」更「妥協」，但約從1922年起因「見到中國之大興國學」，便生「絕國故」之念[51]。傅氏在籌備中央研究院歷史語言研究所時的一份聘書稿中強調，設置這一研究所「非取抱殘守缺、發揮其所謂國學；實欲以手足之力，取得日新月異之材料，供自然科學付與之工具而從事之，以期新知識之獲得。材料不限國別，方術不擇地域，既以追前賢成學之盛，亦以分異國造詣之隆」[52]。

他進而在其著名的〈歷史語言研究所工作之旨趣〉一文中明確提出「我們反對『國故』一個觀念。如果我們所去研究的材料多半是在中國的，這並不是由於我們專要研究『國』的東西，乃是因爲在中國的材料到我們的手中方便些」。正如在中國的地質或地理、生物、氣象等研究所總多研究中國地質地理、生物和氣象問題，世界上任何一種歷史學或語言學，「要想做科學的研究，只得用同一的方法；所以這學問斷不以國別成邏輯的分別，不過是因地域的方便成分工」[53]。十多年後，他在論證「國學」的「不通」時，仍指出其內容「不外乎文字聲韻之考訂、

51 〈朱家驊、傅斯年致李石曾、吳稚暉書〉，《傅斯年全集》(台北：聯經出版公司，1980)，第7冊，頁101。

52 「史語所公文檔案」，元130，轉引自王汎森，〈民國的新史學及其批評者〉，收入羅志田主編，《20世紀的中國：學術與社會(史學卷)》，頁69。

53 對於傅斯年來說，這「並不是名詞的爭執，實在是精神的差異的表顯」。從學理上看，國學這名詞不通達之處在於，若「在語言學或歷史學的範圍中」論國學，「為求這些題目的解決與推進」而「擴充材料，擴充工具，勢必至於弄到不國了，或不故了，或且不國不故了」。傅斯年，〈歷史語言研究所工作之旨趣〉，收其《史料論略及其他》，頁46-47。

歷史事跡之考證，前者即所謂語言學，後者即所謂史學；此外如中國專有之材料，亦皆有專科治之」（這與柳詒徵的觀念何其相近）。傅氏斷言，「分類而以近代眼光治之者，即所謂史學、語學及其他科目」；惟「籠統而以傳統之咿唔爲之者，即所謂國學」[54]。

此後反對「國學」者也大多沿襲柳詒徵、許嘯天和傅斯年的取向，何炳松以爲，「西洋的學術，無論他是屬於哲學或者屬於科學，沒有不以論理學爲根據的；而論理學上基本的必要的初步就是『正名』」。如果「對於中國學術上的正名這一步基本的必要工作還沒有做好，就想要去研究中國的學術，我以爲這是古今中外的學術界未曾有過的笑話」。若要正名，則「國學兩個字就犯了『名不正』的毛病。究竟『國學』是什麼？現在誰能下一個合理的定義？」中國人「既然自命有一種國學，那麼中國國學的特質是什麼？他的真價值究竟怎樣？」[55]

何氏嘗追尋國學二字「從何而來」，但「在中國書中總是查考不出他的來歷」，遂估計其「大概是由西文中翻譯出來」。他說，西人對「中國民族、語言、文字、歷史等」頗有興趣，而「一時不容易理出頭緒」，故混稱爲「支那學」(Sinology)。之所以如此，即因中國的事物太廣大複雜，無法理解，甚或不過「還是一團糟」，所以姑以此名。但「就我們自己方面看去，這個名詞，實在是西洋人給我們的一種恥辱；換句話說，就是我們的國恥。我們決不應該俯首的接受他，我們應該提出強硬的抗議」。不過，看似民族主義甚強的何炳松實際又同意西人認爲中國學術對世界無甚貢獻的暗示，他問道，「國學的聲浪鬧了這許多年，我們所得的成績究竟有多少」？其「對於世界學術究竟曾經有過一種什麼貢獻」？如果對這些都不知道，則所謂國學「還不就是『一團糟』的別名麼？還不就是廣義的『經史百家雜鈔』麼」？

---

54 傅斯年致朱家驊〔抄件〕(1940年7月8日)，台北中研院史語所「傅斯年檔案」。

55 本段與下段，何炳松，〈論所謂「國學」〉，《小說月報》20卷1號(1929年1月)，頁2-3。

鄭振鐸也同意「所謂『國學』便是歐洲人所謂『中國學』」，但他比何炳松似更清楚西方這「總括一切中國學問與事物的研究」。知道其中包括兩類人，「一種是識得中國文字的領事牧師們，一種是未見得識中文，卻是深通某一種專門學問而去研究中國某一種事物的專門家」。第一種人他舉翟理思(H. A. Giles)爲例，說其「對於中國無論什麼事都要談說，文學、藝術、宗教、哲學、歷史、地理，以及一切」，但「這一批人的時代，現在彷彿已經過去了。現代已經進入第二個時代了，便是以專門家去研究關於中國的某一種事物的時代」，後者卻不宜與前者「混而稱之爲『中國學者』」[56]。

前一種歐洲「中國學」的內容，「一加分析，卻是什麼都沒有，且是不能成立的」；則與其「同義的『國學』，其內容當然也不外於此」。後者在中國也有，各以其專業知識來研究中國特定事物，其「研究的雖是中國的東西，他們本身卻不承認自己是『國學家』，我們也不該承認他們是『國學家』。他們只是植物學家、礦物學家、天文學家、化學家，而獨不是『國學家』！而我們今日之所謂『國學家』者，則是異乎他們的另一類人」。當時雖有專門的「國學」、「國學系」和「國學家」等名稱存在，卻都不具備與前述各學、各系、各學者相提並論的資格。其實鄭振鐸也有些信口開河，植物和礦物學家或可以專門研究「中國的東西」，天文學家和化學家便很難如此，否則多半只能納入科學史的範圍。

「國學」一名詞本是清季從日本傳來，何以到此時這些學者會認爲是西方「中國學」一詞的對譯？豈不是有點中學源出西學說的意味了！是何炳松、鄭振鐸等太年輕而不諳舊事？還是《國粹學報》及留日學生「革命報刊」的影響已式微到在國人集體歷史記憶中已基本抹去的程度？或者是西方漢學家的成就開始大量傳入中國並已嚇倒中國學者？這些問題都非常

56 本段與下一段，鄭振鐸，〈且慢談所謂「國學」〉，《小說月報》，20卷1號，頁9-10。

值得認真思考。當初清季學人爲了中國的復興，曾再造出一種包容西學的開放性「國學」；如今這些否定「國學」者的基本依據則是其與西方學科分類體系不合；隨著時代的變化，中學與西學的關係已從「積極防禦」變爲棄而不守。不過，民初這些否定「國學」者也有其進一步的思慮。

傅斯年先就說過，「『國學』、『中國學』等等名詞，說來都甚不詳。西洋人造了支那學『新諾邏輯』一個名詞，本是和埃及脫邏輯、亞西里亞邏輯同等看的，難道我們自己也要如此看嗎」[57]？何炳松接著申論說，西人所稱「埃及學」、「亞述學」以至「東方學」等，無不是針對早已亡國的民族之學術，而「我們中國現在依然是中國，中國民族依然是中國民族」，竟然仿效這樣的例子，「這不是我們讀書人的奇恥大辱麼」？且德法美英日各國的學問發達都超過中國，「何以世界上並沒有什麼德國學、法國學、美國學、英國學和日本學？而我們中國獨有所謂『國學』」？各國皆對世界學術有貢獻(注意其中日本的貢獻是「東洋的史地學」)，「但是他們都絕對沒有什麼國學」[58]。

西人沒有國學或國故學是當時一個流行的說法，實則西方的學情(套改「國情」)與中國的不同，整個西歐甚至北美文化的主流皆源於希臘羅馬和猶太文化，而關於「西方」這一區域文明的研究不僅早就存在，迄今仍是學校的必修或主修課程(原來皆是必修，只是近年文化多元論興起，有些學校才改爲主修)。若按民初的中國術語，此正所謂「西方故學」，焉能說無！說到國家，至少日本就有其國學。這本是常識，黃遵憲的《日本國志》已提及，清季不僅國粹學派每言及此，就是讀書不甚多的山西舉人劉大鵬也知有所謂「倭學」[59]。

本來「學科」的劃分更多是爲了研究的方便，從根本上言，知識是否必須分類至少是一個可以討論的問題。且西學本身也是個變量，「學

57 傅斯年，〈歷史語言研究所工作之旨趣〉，收其《史料論略及其他》，頁47。
58 何炳松，〈論所謂「國學」〉，《小說月報》，20卷1號，頁3-4。
59 劉大鵬，《退想齋日記》，喬志強標注(山西人民出版社，1990)，頁149。

科」的分聚與興衰往往隨外在的社會需求和學理內部的發展而演化。在二戰後的西方，區域研究已成爲正式的學科門類，今日西方一些大學(特別是層次較高的大學)多設有專門的區域研究系或科(專業)。如果深究，這其中當然也能發現類似所謂「東方主義」的偏見，但基本不具何、鄭等人當年所設想的「侮辱」意味；蓋不僅有「中國學」(Chinese Studies)，所謂發達國家也多有以國命名的「區域研究」，如人人看重的美國就有「美國學」(American Studies)在。

20世紀20年代的中國學者當然不能預知西學的發展，但前引學者不少是留學生，或至少能讀外文，其對西方或日本的情形似不應太隔膜；他們在比附西學分類時顯露出的這種隨意性的傾向，提示著某種學理之外的關懷。可知他們雖從學科分類上反對所謂「國學」，實不僅著意於概念，恐怕更關心的是提倡「國學」在當時的「言外之意」：他們有著與清季士人類似的擔心，即由趨新領袖胡適等提倡以「新眼光讀古書」可能導致對中國富強所急需的另一類「科學」的忽視。何炳松列舉的富強之國與已亡之國的對比相當能說明問題，傅斯年所說的「國學之下都僅僅是些言語、歷史、民俗等等題目」，而不包括「算學、天文、物理、化學等等」更提示出其隱憂之所在[60]。

曹聚仁便一則曰「談國學者，大都痛惡科學。以爲科學乃物質文明，國學爲精神文明」。再則曰「習常之目『國故』，殆與疇昔所謂『中學』、『國學』者同其內包外延；本『唯我獨尊』之精神以治『國故』，在昔則有『中學爲體、西學爲用』之夸談，在今則有『國學爲精神文明』，科學爲物質文明」之高論[61]。這些表述相當清晰地提示出其思路之所指。前引鄭振鐸把「古書訓詁」排除在學術和「知識」之外更揭示了時代的認知：只有中國當前需要的、與「物質文明」相關的西來

60 傅斯年，〈歷史語言研究所工作之旨趣〉，收其《史料論略及其他》，頁47。
61 曹聚仁，〈國故學之意義與價值〉、〈春雷初動中之國故學〉，《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁53、93。

之「科學」(也涵義甚廣且有分歧)才是「知識」，而提倡「古書訓詁」就妨礙了「科學」的推廣，因此必須反對。

康白情在1919年曾說，那時有一種「『國而不粹』的國粹家——就是說只要是國的，就是粹的，就是該敬奉的、該闡揚的」[62]。但北伐之後相當多的人態度恰反之，他們差不多主張「只要是國的，就不是粹的」。不過，盡管當時一些學人不承認國學是「學」，真正落實到具體治學之上時，學者們又發現比較有成就的還正是國學，也只有國學。顧頡剛就注意到「別的科學不發達而惟有國學發達」的現象[63]。更具詭論意味的是，許多否定「國學」之學人又有強烈的傳統「資格」觀念，他們一方面不承認「國學」的學術正當性，同時又努力區分新舊，不許一些不具備某些新舊「資格」的人「尸國學之名」[64]。

區分新舊的努力：國學的排他性

早在新文化運動時期毛子水就在強調「國故的資格」，他認爲「從外國葛郎瑪採取來的」《馬氏文通》「實在是一種最有用的國故學」，但林紓的「古文」，一因其是現代人所作，不能算「古人的學術思想和

62 康白情，〈「太極圖」與Phallicism〉，《新潮》，1卷4號(1919年4月1日)，頁675。按康氏自己主張「『國而不粹』的國粹，值不得研究」，而應研究「『又國又粹』的國粹」(參見頁680-681)。

63 參見羅志田，〈走向國學與史學的「賽先生」〉，《近代史研究》，2000年3期。

64 這是借用柳詒徵1922年覆章太炎書中的話，他批判當時借「國學」之名行反傳統之實的現象說：「今古文之聚訟，由於古籍湮沉，非待壁簡復出，蔑能斷案。惟今文家喜為非常異義可怪之論，頗合近世好奇心理；故於經術毫無所得者，輒侈然以今文家自命。疑經蔑古，即成通人；揚墨詆孔，以傳西教。後生小子，利其可以抹殺一切，而又能尸國學之名，則放恣顛倒，無所不至。」柳詒徵，〈覆章太炎書〉，《史地學報》，1卷4期(1922年8月)，頁250。此文承王東傑君提示、徐雁平君代為抄錄，謹此致謝！柳氏說此話時整理國故剛開始抬頭，故國學之名能尸；北伐後國學地位雖大降，而反對國學的新派仍不准某些人「尸國學之名」，其意味至深且長。

歷史」；二來林紓自己就說過科學不用古文的話，故可以斷定其「沒有國故的資格」。他進而說，如果這種兩不是的「古文」也是應當研究的國故，「那『八股』『試帖』亦就是我們所應當研究的國故了。到那時候，國故在今日世界學術上究竟有位置沒有，我就不知道了」。這大概即是張煊等人當時在《國故》上撰文「要把『國』和『故』爭一個地位」的時代語境，值得注意的是毛子水的「國故」並不像胡適所說的那樣中立，無疑具有明顯的排他性[65]。

後來主張「國故」是「五千年間中華民族以文字表達之結晶思想」的曹聚仁繼承了這一點，他也將下列三種排除在「國故」之外：「(一)無病呻吟之詩文(張三李四之文集屬之)；(二)未經熔化之外來文化(初期之佛教經典、基督教經典……皆屬之)；(三)原民時代所遺留之迷信(《推背圖》、風水之類屬之)；皆未可指爲中華民族之結晶思想，不得列於『國故』之林」[66]。可知曹氏的「結晶思想」也非中性，其所謂「國故」基本即「國粹」。過去學者一般都接受胡適的說法，即「國故」一詞的採納正因其是中性的，現在看來時人認知的「中性」也是有限的。正如前引傅斯年所說，「國故本來即是國粹，不過說來客氣一點兒」。整理國故的新派在努力區別於保存國粹的舊派時，無意中仍傳承了不少舊派的思想。

從義和團開始，20世紀的中國就有一條隱而不顯的潛流，即傳統文化中屬於「子不語」的怪力亂神以一種詭論性的方式逐漸從異端走入正統；新文化運動時陳獨秀、胡適、吳稚暉都曾觀察到怪力亂神的「猖獗」，而這些反孔教的新派人物卻又都繼承了儒家的正統精神，總試圖

65 毛子水，〈國故和科學的精神〉，《新潮》，1卷5號，頁741-742；並參見羅志田，〈古今與中外的時空互動：新文化運動時期關於整理國故的思想論爭〉，《近代史研究》，2000年6期。

66 曹聚仁，〈國故學之意義與價值〉，《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁61、63。

打擊此種舊文化「妖焰」的復熾[67]。曹聚仁所提出的《推背圖》是一個象徵，而早幾年的北大學生曾對另一個介乎於正統與異端之間的《太極圖》進行了討伐。

民初「科學」的影響日強，不但湖北有以數學論證三從、婦順的嘗試，北京也有大學教授從哲學角度研究《太極圖》。康白情極爲不滿地說，「古代野蠻思想所結晶、裝滿了Phallicism〔生殖崇拜〕的原則的『太極圖』，輾轉瞎傳了幾千年，直到如今科學萬能的世界，還有人敬奉他、闡揚他，這是我國學術界怎麼大的一個汙點呀」！他認爲這正是「一般自命爲國粹家」認不清國粹，「把極幼稚極無價值極與他不相干的東西，都引來當了他的同類」。康氏指出，似這樣「步先儒的後塵，還去尋那想從糟粕裡嚼出酒來的生涯，那就不惟『悖時』，可真是『庸人自擾』了」[68]。

其實他自己才有些「步先儒的後塵」而不自覺。且不論《太極圖》是否生殖崇拜，即是，何以就「極幼稚極無價值」而「值不得研究」呢？這是典型的三家村理學家心態，不過與西來「科學」結合，由科學爲之正名罷了[69]。康白情以爲，「我們要研究的東西，總要擇有用的、實際的、合乎科學的」，《太極圖》卻不具備這些要求；「凡是一種哲理，必須要備具明白的解說、分析的思想、條貫的理論」，這三樣《太極圖》也「一無所有，所以根本不能認爲哲理」；最重要的是，「『太極圖』基於神秘的觀念而作成，與現在的科學思想根本衝突，所以不能成爲研究的問題」。不過康氏畢竟與村學究有點區別，他雖認爲《太極

67 這個問題擬另文探討，一些初步的看法參見羅志田，〈從異端走入正統的「子不語」：庚子義和團事件表現出的歷史轉折〉，《歷史教學》，2001年2期。

68 本段與下段，康白情，〈「太極圖」與Phallicism〉，《新潮》，1卷4號，頁680-681。

69 民初「科學」的社會功能甚強，既能為村學究的理學觀念正名，也能為考據正名。參見羅志田，〈走向國學與史學的「賽先生」〉，《近代史研究》，2000年3期。

圖》不能「當做哲學史的材料」，更萬萬不能「當做哲理去研究」，到底還肯定可以「把他當做社會史的材料」。

傅斯年稍後指出：「《太極圖》這個玩藝兒，本是妖道造的；然而居然有幾位宋儒先生大談特談，這是爲何呢？我想彼時科學毫不發達，他的宇宙觀不能基於科學觀念，而又不肯不想像他的宇宙觀，所以才有這類的可笑的見解。在當時的知識狀態之下，這類見解也未嘗不可聊備一格。」而現在就不同了，「現代的哲學是被科學陶鑄過的，想研究他，必須不和現代的科學立於反背的地位」，並「應用現代的科學中所得作爲根據」。他顯然更重視「談哲學者」的資格：「沒有受當代各類學問的深培養，或者竟不知道當代學問的門徑」，都「不便在北京某大學裡以陰陽乾坤的渾沌話箸《太極圖》說，或者在著名報紙上談道體、循環、氣數」[70]。

《太極圖》大致還在所謂「正邪之間」，隨著整理國故的推廣，國學的地位上升，更屬異端的怪力亂神也漸以國學自居。曹聚仁自鄉返中時，便在舟中遇一白髮婆娑之老翁，「津津談扶乩降神之神跡不已，且屢陳呂洞賓文昌帝降壇之詩詞文筆以實之」；更「喟然曰：『此我國之國學也。國學之不講也久矣，微吾儕，誰其任之』！他到杭州，又發現有道德學社，實「一神秘不可思議之宗教，與大同教相伯仲。其社奉段正元爲師尊，其徒事之如神、禮之如佛，以『大道宏開』爲幟，以『天眼通』爲秘，而貪財如命，不知人間有廉恥事。然亦自命爲道業之正統、國學之嫡系」。這使他感到了問題的嚴重：「在昔，俗儒淺陋，尙知自慚；今則標卜算業者、習堪輿業者、以及吟壇雅士，皆得以宣揚國學自命」。由於「國學無確定之界說、無確定之範圍，籠統不著邊際，人乃得盜竊而比附之」，結果成爲「百穢之所聚、眾惡之所趨，而中國

70 傅斯年，〈對於中國今日談哲學者之感念〉，《新潮》，1卷5號(1919年5月1日)，頁725-726。

腐敗思想之藪藏所」[71]。

何炳松也觀察到：「我國近來『國』字的風靡一時，好像中國無論什麼一種醜東西，只要加上了一個國字，就立刻一登龍門，身價十倍的樣子。五更天十八扯的調子，現在不叫做小調而叫做『國樂』了；賣狗皮膏藥的勾當，現在不叫做走江湖而叫做『國醫』了；甚至前一個月上海四馬路上的餛飩舖，亦要叫做『國菜館』了。這樣類推下去，那麼小腳、辮子、鴉片，等等東西，亦都可以叫做『國腳』、『國辮』、『國煙』了。這不但弄得『斯文掃地』，而且『國』字竟變成一切妖魔鬼怪的護身符了。這不是國學兩個字所引出來的流弊麼？」[72] 小腳、辮子、鴉片等固然久已是被攻擊的對象，但五更調、狗皮膏藥、餛飩鋪這些下層社會的象徵在何氏眼裡竟成「妖魔鬼怪」，意味相當深長；本來新文化運動是希望走向民間的，然一些新人物以資格論人的習性又相當深重，何氏的言說正是一個典型的例證。

不僅這些社會底層的人與物借「國學」而攀升，魯迅在1922年發現，「不知怎的那時忽而有許多人都自命為國學家了」。具體地說就是出現了一些歷史上儒林和文苑裡均不存的「暴發的『國學家』」，即刻書的商人和洋場小說家。「茶商鹽販，本來是不齒於『士類』的，現在也趁著新舊紛擾的時候，借刻書為名，想挨進遺老遺少的『士林』裡去」。同時，洋場上的鴛鴦蝴蝶派文人，「自有洋場以來，從沒有人稱這些文章(？)為國學，他們自己也並不以『國學家』自命的。現在不知何以忽而奇想天開，也學了茶商鹽販，要憑空挨進『國學家』隊裡去」。他注意到，「當假的國學家正在打牌喝酒，真的國學家正在穩坐高齋讀古書的時候」，斯坦因已將西北的「漢晉簡牘掘去了；不但掘去，而且做出書來了。所以真要研究國學，便不能不翻回來」。故「中

71 曹聚仁，〈春雷初動中之國故學〉，《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁92。

72 何炳松，〈論所謂「國學」〉，《小說月報》，20卷1號，頁4。

國的國學不發達則已，萬一發達起來，則請恕我直言，可是斷不是洋場上的自命爲國學家，『所能厠足其間者也』的了」[73]。

魯迅的觀察確比一般人深刻，他看到了民初社會秩序的調整；必先要因「新舊紛擾」而出現既存社會秩序的紊亂，這些「暴發」者才有「挨進士林」的可能，而且這是剛出現不久的現象。「國學」這一涵義混淆的學問門類在此竟然成爲轉變社會身分認同的工具，多少體現了民族主義情緒的興起，而「國學」那「功夫在詩外」的吸引力也得以凸顯。魯迅當時寫了相當多挖苦「國學家」的文字，多是指上海「自命爲國學家」的鴛鴦蝴蝶派；即使上引文中只能讀古書的「真國學家」，或者也得不到他的承認。他心目中理想的國學家應該是像王國維那樣不僅能讀外國書，且能利用「古書」以外的材料治學者。

前面說過，當陳獨秀只看見王國維的文學成就時，魯迅已注意到他爲《流沙墜簡》寫的長序，並以此爲真國學家的標準。王國維此時所治，大體不出「儒林」一系的經史學；雖然治學的具體方法有非常大的轉變，但其所關注的對象其實相當「傳統」。魯迅的界定也相當嚴謹，他所針對的主要是上海洋場的鴛鴦蝴蝶派文人；而前引曹聚仁所謂「吟壇雅士，皆得以宣揚國學自命」，所打擊的對象就寬廣得多了。這些人未必能得魯迅的真正認可，但其大致還可歸入讀古書的「真國學家」一類，雖不能入「儒林」，尙在「文苑」範圍之內。

本來「文苑」一線的學問在西來的新學科分類確立之後，應與「儒林」一系並列而平等。但魯迅的言說表明，從「集部書」轉化出的學科是兩分的，以西方概念的「文學」命名者自認新的「正統」，並不承認休閒「說部」作者與其同類，儘管後者自有其市場、自有其領域（實際上其市場和領域都遠更廣大）；而曹聚仁的言說進一步提示著這兩者在

73 魯迅，〈熱風・題記〉、〈所謂「國學」〉、〈不懂的音譯〉，《魯迅全集》，第1卷，頁292、388-389、398-399。

某種程度上又都仍不為「儒林」人所看重。這裡傳統的無意識傳承是多層面的，且與新興觀念互滲以至結合在一起了。

當時一個有意思的現象是，反對整理國故或反對「國學」的新派學者大多或是實際不治王國維那樣的國學（特別史學）而偏重於「文學」者，然而這些依靠西方學術分類而正當化的「文學」從業者仍傳承著比較守舊的正統學術觀念，看不起舊式的「文人」。沈雁冰在1923年底注意到，「現在有的批評整理國故，卻不肯據理討論，而徒憑主觀，說整理國故的人們不是老秀才乘勢出鋒頭，便是不通西文的人以此為藏拙之道、自衛之方」。沈氏認為這是「武斷的態度、謾罵的口吻」[74]，但不許「老秀才」一類人與聞整理國故或國學終成為一個很有影響的觀念。

許嘯天在否定「國故學」時說，「國故學」三個字，是一個極不徹底極無界限極浪漫極混亂的假定名詞；中國的有國故學，便足以證明中國人絕無學問，又足以證明中國人雖有學問而不能用」。然相對說來，國故學「還算是頭腦比較清晰的人所發明的；有的稱『國學』，有的稱『舊學』，有的稱『國粹學』。在從前老前輩嘴裡常常標榜的什麼『經史之學』、『文獻之學』、『漢學』、『宋學』；那班窮秀才，也要自附風雅，把那爛調的時文詩賦，也硬派在『國粹學』的門下。種種名目，搜羅起來，便成了今日所謂的『國故學』。」[75] 這樣，「國故學」之所以不成立的一個重要原因是「老前輩」和「窮秀才」的參與；但他顯然又把「老前輩」和「窮秀才」分為兩檔，前者乃是所謂「國粹學」者，後者若要參與便屬「自附風雅」了。

吳文祺自己基本從事於「文學」，但前面引過，他對做駢文、古文、詩詞、歌賦、對聯的「老先生們」實看不起；在他看來，「前清的科舉餘孽，能有幾個懂國故學？雖然不能說他們個個不懂，但據我所知

74 茅盾，〈雜感〉（1923年12月），《茅盾全集》第18卷（人民文學出版社，1989），頁405。

75 許嘯天，《國故學討論集　新序》，第1集，頁3-4。

道的，十個秀才有九個不懂。現在有人說整理國故是老秀才乘勢出鋒頭，若不是故作違心之論，便是無的放矢的囈語」[76]！從這些新人物對秀才的蔑視看，社會秩序的變遷固然使久處邊緣的老秀才們思有所動、有「挨進」國學家社群的願望，但恐怕也只能在沒有真懂新舊「國故學」者的地方——比如遺老和新人物都離異的鄉間——才或有所得；可惜民國的鄉間已不怎麼講學問，結果是老秀才仍然不行，只有洋場文人尚存希望。

專門為「國學」辯護的顧頡剛所治基本在「儒林」一線，他也特別注重將北大那科學的「國學」區別於「老學究們所說的國學」。顧氏強調，雙方雖同「在故紙堆中作生活」，但「無論我們的研究在故紙之外尚有實物的考查，就是我們完全投身於故紙堆中，也與他們截然異趣」，就像拜火的野蠻人與研究火的物理學家的差別一樣。老學究們「要把過去的文化作為現代人生活的規律，要把古聖賢遺言看做『國粹』而強迫青年們去服從，他們的眼光全注在應用上，他們原是夢想不到什麼叫作研究的，當然說不到科學」。簡言之，北大的是「研究國學的人」，老學究們則是「國粹論者」，故「我們也當然不能把國學一名輕易送給他們」[77]。

那時以「文學」著稱的鄭振鐸甚至以為，當時的「『國學』乃是中學校的『國文』一課的擴大，『國學家』乃是中學校的『國文教師』的抬高。他們是研究中國的事物名理的，然而卻沒有關於事物名理的一般的、正確的、基本的知識；他們是討論一切關於中國的大小問題的，然而他們卻沒有對於這一切問題有過一番普遍的、精密的考察」。這些人的「唯一工具是中國文字，他們的唯一寶庫是古舊的書本。他們的唯一能事是名物訓詁、是章解句釋、是尋章摘句、是闡發古聖賢之道」。除了識中國文字的程度超過部分西方「中國學者」外，這些人「在常識上

76 吳文祺，《重新估定國故學之價值》，《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁48。
77 顧頡剛，〈一九二六年始刊詞〉，《北京大學研究所國學門周刊》，2：13(1926年1月6日)，頁3-4。

也許還要遠遜於」後者；有時「即在對於古書的理解力上也許還要讓他們——西方的中國學者——高出一頭地」[78]。

鄭氏指出，所謂的「國學」和「國學家」其實「不是現代的產物，也不是從天上落下來的時代寵兒。他們在中國幾千年的歷史上便已屢屢的演著他們的把戲了。原來他們的前身，便是所謂『士大夫』的一種特殊的階級。……『士大夫階級』有幸而生於數十百千年前，便做了宰天下的高官；我們的『國學家』不幸而生於百十年後的今天，便只好沒落而做了一種『蒙館先生』變相的『國學大師』。近代社會變遷如此之大，以前可做高官者如今已淪落到只能做「蒙館先生」，故其「在今日的中國是一無所用的廢物」。鄭振鐸無意中對「中學國文教師」和「蒙館先生」的輕視，再次體現了新人物的「資格」觀念有多麼強。

應該說，正因為「國學」一度成為轉變社會身分認同的途徑，才有那麼多試圖「暴發」者產生「挨進士林」的願望並嘗試實現此願望，這說明整理國故的一度風行確實不可低估。而新派人物力圖將某些研究對象和讀書人群體排斥在「國學」或「國故學」之外，或者揭示出一種希望維持其「清純」的意味；對那些實際參與或支持以科學方法整理國故的學人來說，他們大概也真希望藉此區別於許多並不「科學」或不懂「科學方法」卻又企圖「盜國學之名」者。在這方面，他們也有實際的努力。

前面說過，胡適就力圖將「國學」與「古學」區分開來，他描述當時古學的狀況說：「有些人還以為孔教可以完全代表中國的古文化，所以他們至今還夢想孔教的復興；甚至於有人竟想抄襲基督教的制度來光復孔教。有些人還以為古文古詩的保存就是古學的保存了，所以他們至今還想壓語體文字的提倡與傳播。至於那些靜坐扶乩、逃向迷信裡去自尋安慰的，更不用說了。在我們看起來，這些反動都只是舊式學者破產

78 本段與下段，鄭振鐸，〈且慢談所謂「國學」〉，《小說月報》，20卷1號，頁10-12。

的鐵證；這些行爲，不但不能挽救他們所憂慮的國學之淪亡，反可以增加國中少年人對於古學的藐視。」[79] 正因此，以科學方法整理國故者總思有別於已「破產」的「舊式學者」。

曹聚仁便提出「轟國學」的口號以安頓「國故學」，他在1925年說：「國學二字，浮動於吾人之腦際者經年矣。聞有一二博學者不察，用以爲中國舊文化之總攝名詞，逐流者乃交相引用；今則國學如麻，略識『之無』、能連綴成篇，謂爲精通『國學』；咿唔詩賦，以推敲詞句自豪者，謂爲保存『國粹』。他則大學設科研究中國文學，乃以國學名其系；開館教授四書五經，乃以國學名其院。人莫解國學之實質，而皆以國學鳴其高。勢之所趨，國學將爲國故學之致命傷。國學一日不去，國故學一日不安。斬釘截鐵，惟有轟之一法。」[80]

在學術界之內，曹氏觀察到，「以『整理國故』一事而論」，就有北京大學之國學研究所、無錫之國學專修館和上海同善社之國學專修館，三者皆「以『國學』爲幟」。惟三者「雖同標一幟」，其實「必不能並立」。故「『國學』之爲物，名雖爲一，實則爲三」：北大的是「賽先生之『國學』」，無錫的是「冬烘先生之『國學』」，而上海的則是「神怪先生之『國學』」，三者「決無合作之餘地」。前引傅斯年論述史語所旨趣時，曾明確將該所區別於「抱殘守缺、發揮其所謂國學」者；他也試圖控制史語所的規模，主張「用不著去引誘別人也好這個」，以防「愛好的主觀過於我們的人進來時，帶進了烏煙瘴氣」[81]。對當時許多新派而言，「抱殘守缺」和「烏煙瘴氣」大致即分別是「冬烘先生」和「神怪先生」兩種「國學」的代名詞，科學派每欲區別之。

但當時「國學界」的情形尚更複雜，較難歸入以上三類的至少有清

---

79 胡適，〈《國學季刊》發刊宣言〉，《胡適文存二集》，卷1，頁2。

80 本段與下段，曹聚仁，〈春雷初動中之國故學〉，《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁88、84-85。

81 傅斯年，〈歷史語言研究所工作之旨趣〉，收其《史料論略及其他》，頁47-48。

華、燕京和東南大學的國學機構，尤其是後者。如果一定要依此分類，這三校的國學機構皆當計入「賽先生之國學」一類；但這些機構與北大國學門是否能相互接受，恐怕還是個問題。尤其東大(及其後身中央大學)和北大之間的「蜀洛之爭」持續甚久，是民初教育界人所共知的事實，而東大亦是反對新文化運動的《學衡》之大本營，稍後《學衡》主編吳宓又遷清華主持研究院，這些因素都增加了彼此關係的複雜性，難以按曹氏的劃分簡單歸類。有一點是無疑的，即各正式大學的國學機構或多或少都受到北大國學門及胡適推動的整理國故之影響，但其共同之處仍不能掩蓋彼此間明顯的歧異[82]。

燕京大學國學研究所內部就曾在更多繼承中國傳統學術還是更多學習西方研究方法上出現不同意見，而後者似更占上風。惟該所成立於1928年，已在曹聚仁的分類之後，暫可不論[83]。清華研究院的成立雖然得到北大方面尤其胡適的幫助，然這一幫助不宜誇大。如果清華校長曹雲祥真像有些人所說那樣受胡適的影響，恐怕不會聘請與胡對立色彩極爲鮮明的吳宓來主事。吳宓是該院實際規劃的主要設計者和開辦前期的主持者[84]，他就明確宣布，「本校研究院在中國實屬創舉，他校如北京大學亦設國學研究所，然組織辦法頗有不同」。吳氏更具體指出，清華

82 下面的討論請先參閱桑兵〈晚清民國時期的國學研究與西學〉，《歷史研究》1996年5期；陳以愛，《中國現代學術研究機構的興起》，頁396-404；劉龍心〈學科體制與近代中國史學的建立〉，《20世紀的中國：學術與社會(史學卷)》，頁554-564。

83 參見張寄謙、〈哈佛燕京學社〉，《近代史研究》，1990年3期；陶飛亞、吳梓明〈燕京大學的國學教育與研究〉，《學人》，第13輯(1998年3月)。

84 按據張彭春所說，研究院的〈章程〉最初可能是張起草的：「改造清華的思想大半出於我。因為文字不便，都讓別人用為己有去了。所謂研究院、專門科草案，都是我擬的。現在用我意思的人，一點也不承認誰是產生他們的」(張彭春，《日程草案》，即其日記，1925年10月7日。原件藏美國哈佛燕京圖書館，我所用的是中央研究院近代史所的微縮膠卷)。按張氏最重國文和國學基礎知識，傾向於《學衡》，所以研究院章程最初非吳宓起草而能得吳之認可，惟定稿必經吳宓手，蓋張已承認自己中文「文字不便」也。

的國學「取材於歐美學者研究東方語言及中國文化之成績，此又本校研究院之異於國內之研究國學者」[85]。其實北大國學門又何嘗不欲師法歐美，不過其成員混雜，且受日本東洋學(新式漢學)的影響甚於西洋的東方學，故吳宓特別強調清華之異於北大，應非意氣之爭。

東南大學的情形又更複雜，實際上，與一般認知中南北對立的形象不同，東南大學的史學學人似尚較認同於北大的國學研究所。東大的《史地學報》在介紹北大《國學季刊》時對胡適起草的〈發刊宣言〉將國故學界定爲「研究中國過去歷史文化的學問」一點甚爲贊同，並據此認爲「《國學季刊》與中國史學前途關係至巨」，而其「編輯任稿之人皆國內之俊碩，必尤有以昌明吾國之史學」。稍後《史地學報》在介紹北大國學門時更承認，「在今日情形下，吾人謂北大國學研究所爲國史研究之中心，殆無不可也。本會與京都遠隔，無由知其詳情，惟中心嚮往，頗願國人同爲注意」[86]。可知當時南北兩校在發展以史學爲中心的「國學」方面立場相當接近。但東大的國學研究院是以國文系爲核心，態度就有些不同。

有意思的是，在北大之中，史學門曾是比文學門更偏舊的陣營，劉龍心的研究說明，部分由於文科學長陳獨秀以獎勵新文學、發展中國文學門爲首務，部分因爲既存的國史編纂處與中國史學門的密切關聯，結果如後來的史學門主任朱希祖所說，中國文學門的教員「於新文學有慊者，大都改歸中國史學門」。當陳獨秀希望在中國文學門任教的朱希祖「至日本考察史學一二年，歸爲史學門主任，改革一切」時，朱氏因其「方專研究新文學，曾著文學論及白話文之價值等文從事鼓吹，不願改入史學門」[87]。

85 吳宓，〈清華開辦研究院之旨趣及經過〉，《清華大學史料選編》，第1卷，頁374-375。

86 《史地學報》，2卷4號(1923)，頁139；2卷5號，頁119。

87 參見劉龍心，〈學科體制與近代中國史學的建立〉，《二十世紀的中國：學術與社會(史學卷)》，頁519-523。引文皆自朱希祖，〈北京大學史學系過去之略史與將來之希望〉，收入《北京大學卅一周年紀念刊》，甚謝劉龍心小姐賜贈此文的複印件。

按朱希祖的學問在文史之間，後來更以史學見長，此時不願入中國史學門，恐怕更多是希望避免「舊派」的認同。所以，南北兩校史學方面的相對接近(在治學取向方面仍有許多歧異)的一個原因可能是東大史學系比其國文系稍更趨新、而北大中國史學門又比其中國文學門更偏舊。

不過，即使東大國文系的國學研究院，也與北大取向有許多相近處[88]。但當時一些新派卻力圖破除這樣的認知，而強調雙方之差異。對北大也取批評態度的吳文祺以為，「東大的《國學叢刊》的〈發刊詞〉完全是保存國粹者的口吻，尤其沒有批評的價值」[89]。很明顯，吳氏「批評的價值」已前定，實不允所謂保存國粹者「預流」。

按顧實撰寫的〈發刊詞〉雖不無文人舊態，語多含混，然其論國學之「四善」說，治國學者決不像唐中葉以後的駢文古文那樣「止爭形式，不問思想」；也不像八股家那樣「高談義理，力追八家，字尚未識，便詡發明」。蓋「國學之於今日」，實「掃千年科舉之積毒，作一時救世之良藥」。對於西學，他不主張根柢淺薄即言溝通，以免產生隔閡甚至矛盾；但仍肯定西學的作用，認為「海禁既開，異學爭鳴，截長補短，獲益宏多」。同時，顧實更反對那種倡廢漢字、摧燒古書的主張，希望達到「為學有本，則不忘己而循人，不隨波而逐流；庶幾學融中外，集五洲之聖於一堂」的境界[90]。這的確有些像清季國粹學派特別是鄧實、黃節等人的態度，希望有別於八股家和崇洋者，而熔漢宋中西於一爐。然從根本精神上看，這一取向與北大國學門仍是同大於異。

稍後顧實為國學院起草〈整理國學計劃書〉說：「自昔閉關一統之世，知有天下而不知有國家。迨海禁既開，稍知西方，於是有中西對舉

---

88 參見陳以愛，《中國現代學術研究機構的興起》，頁396-398；劉龍心，〈學科體制與近代中國史學的建立〉，《20世紀的中國：學術與社會(史學卷)》，頁560-561。

89 吳文祺，〈重新估定國故學之價值〉，《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁34-35。

90 顧實，〈發刊辭〉，《國學叢刊》，1：1(1923年1月)，頁1-2，以下幾段同。本文承蘇位智教授賜贈，謹此致謝。

之名詞，如中文西文、中學西學、中醫西醫之類是也。邇來國家觀念普及於人人，於是國民、國文、國語、國樂、國技、國粹、國故、國產種種冠以國字之一類名詞，復觸目皆是。今日學者間之有國學問題，甚囂塵上，亦其一也。」[91] 可知其觀察到的現象與後來何炳松、鄭振鐸所見一致，且認爲國學地位在學術界的飆升是受全社會「國家觀念普及」的影響。

前引曹聚仁1925年末所撰文說，「國學二字，浮動於吾人之腦際者經年」一語意味著在他認知中整理國故運動到1924年末才大興，而顧實此文撰於1923年春(原署癸亥四月)，他已注意到學者中「國學問題甚囂塵上」的現象。如果兩人所說皆不錯，似乎南京學界中「國學」的興起尚較上海爲早，頗能「得風氣之先」。然而整理國故這一「風氣」卻是由北大所開，可知南北雙方於此似無太多歧異。顧實並明確提出「今日整理國故學，爲當務之急」，從詞匯的使用到整體的觀念，均與胡適相類。

顧實在論證「整理國故學」時說，「凡一國歷史之綿遠，尤必有其遺傳之學識經驗。內則爲愛國之士所重視，外則爲他邦學者所注意。遠西學風莫不尊重希臘學術、羅馬學術、及其本國學術，吾國亦何獨不宜然」。且中國「夙號世界文明之一源，焉可稍自失其面目」。這確與清季朝野皆用外國事例來論證「保存國粹」的正當性這一點非常相似，但其與北大科學派一樣具有所謂「世界學術」的觀念，〈發刊詞〉本認爲，「學無畔岸，囿國而小」，不過因爲「植基於是，推而遠之，事半功倍」才提倡之。且顧氏也在不斷調整自身的觀念，在〈發刊辭〉中是以小學、經學、史學、諸子、佛典、詩文六類「統名曰國學」；到〈計畫書〉時則說，「國學之範圍，造端於周季六藝、百家」，至今日則包括所有「用中國語言文字記錄之書」；不獨中國，「凡他邦人如近則日本朝鮮、遠則歐美諸國，有中國語言文字記錄之書，亦當在整理之

91 本段與以下數段，顧實起草、國文系通過提出，〈國立東南大學國學院整理國學計劃書〉(癸亥四月)，《國學叢刊》，1：4(1923年12月)，頁121-127。本文承劉龍心小姐代為複製。謹此致謝。

列」。呈現出日益「世界化」的傾向[92]。

惟顧實提出的所謂「兩觀三支」的整理國學方式，則顯然與北大派有較大區別，也因此受到不少人的抨擊。除「主觀」的詩文部外，顧氏的「客觀」一系分爲「以科學理董國故」的科學部和「以國故理董國故」的典籍部。前者約分學說、圖譜、器物三端，後者則分疏證、校理、纂修三端；前者像胡適一樣列出許多文化專史的名目，後者則列出太古史、唐虞史、夏史、商史、周史、秦史等需要「纂修」者和晉、元、宋、明等舊史之「待修訂者」。一位署名天均的批評者注意到這一差別，認爲其「科學方法是適用於一部分的文化專史，而朝代的通史要用國故的方法；這種用法的區分，真真使人『莫名其妙』」[93]。這裡確實反映了新舊學術取向的重要區別：科學派主張推陳出新，故擬做新式的專史；而國故派則提倡溫故知新，故欲補修二十四史之所無或重修其中較差的斷代史[94]。

---

92 不過這正是曹聚仁試圖糾正的觀念，曹氏認為「國故」與「中國學術史」不同，國故僅限於中華民族，「而中國學術史則凡在中國地域所曾有之學術，皆所必載」。參見曹聚仁，〈國故學之意義與價值〉，《國故學討論集》，頁73-74。

93 天均，《評東南大學國學院整理國學計畫書》，《晨報副刊》，1924年3月30日，4版。

94 今日一些西方學者頗願討論「國家民族」觀念對20世紀中國學術的影響，甚至試圖糾正這一影響。然東南大學國學院的〈整理國學計畫書〉提示我們，擬做新式專史的科學派確實明顯受到「國家民族」觀念的影響，他們擬撰的歷史也的確以國家或民族為單位；而欲補修二十四史之所無或重修其中較差的斷代史者在治學上恐未必受到太多「國家民族」觀念的影響，他們根本連梁啓超在20世紀初年對「舊史學」的攻擊也置諸腦後了。若從較長遠的觀念看，當時作為「舊史學」代表的柯劭忞之《新元史》，其時代衝擊力固不如王國維的古史研究和顧頡剛發動的《古史辨》，然實際的學術成就卻不容低估。進而言之，當趨新的傅斯年主張研究斷代史而強烈反對講通史(參見錢穆的回憶)時，這位也曾提出「不國不故」主張的學者是否無意中更接近顧實所說的「以國故理董國故」而疏離於所謂「國家民族」觀念呢？後來張東蓀提倡「必須以民族國家主義為標準來估量一切」，卻指責當時「一班整理國故的人們完全見不及此」(詳後)，也很有提示意義。

換言之，東南大學國學院並不否定且認可北大科學派的取向，但認爲科學派學子也有弊端，即「徒誦數冊講義、報章、雜誌，及奉某某學術書爲神聖，而未嘗根本課讀古書。即課讀古書，亦以著有科學系統之色彩，狃於成見，信口開河」。且「科學本爲不完全之學，今日學者間之所公認；尤必有以補其闕，故更進之以國故理董國故說」。而其「主觀」一系的詩文部更明言「詩文之設，非以理董往籍也，將欲以衡量現代之作品云爾。移風易俗，責無旁貸」；具體則「宜採兩大主義：一、樂天主義，二、成仁主義」。

後者明顯的「文以載道」傾向立刻遭到新文化人的抨擊，周作人首先發難，針對〈計畫書〉欲以詩文「移風易俗」的宗旨說，「東南大學(而且又是國學院)發表這種言論，即使不是意表之內，至少也並非『意表之外』的事，所以不值得怎樣大驚小怪。我從前聽過有人提倡忠臣美術，那麼殺身成仁的烈士文學也是古已有之，算不得什麼新發明。近來批評的建設之呼聲又正是瀰漫全國，衡量現代作品的正宗批評乃應天承運而出現於龍蟠虎踞之京陵，更是適合時勢之要求」。最後一句點明東大的地理位置，顯然有區分南北之意。周氏並挖苦說，〈計畫書〉引章太炎一段話卻將意思讀反，「國學家而不懂國文，那才真是一個大笑話」。國學院諸公若覺「太炎先生的古文真是難懂」，或可讀《太炎白話文》，「一定要更容易了解些」[95]。

以後梁容若撰文呼應周作人，明確表示其立意正在於區分胡適與顧實的「整理國故」。他聽到東南大學有學生說「吾師顧實先生與胡適之整理國故」，從此「知道有一位和胡適之一樣的整理國故的顧先生」；但看了周作人的文章，將東南大學國學院的計畫書找來一看，「從這篇文章裡知道了『國故的理董國故法』，還知道『科學爲不完全之學，此

95 陶然，〈國學院之不通〉，《晨報副刊》，1924年3月27日，4版。

世之公論』」[96]。這些當然也就是梁容若眼中顧實與胡適在「整理國故」方面「不一樣」的地方，所以他要爲雙方正名。

若仔細閱讀東大的〈發刊辭〉和〈計畫書〉(以及後來顧實的一些國學文章)，有一個明顯的特點，就是在表述中力圖運用新詞彙，常常並直接出以英文，可知顧氏相當希望表明他並不守舊而實知新。面臨新派主動劃清新舊界限的努力，他也盡量使用新概念來抵禦新派對其的不承認和不容忍。顧實在〈發刊辭〉中便強調，自由和平等是其探討國學之所本。他在〈計畫書〉中的詩文部更發出「岳武穆之殺，非秦檜殺之也，其社會殺之也！其國民文學殺之也」的慨嘆！這一斷語最受非議[97]，但恐怕有其「當代詮釋」的「今典」在。

到1926年4月，丁福保(仲祜)等人在上海發起組織「中國國學研究會」，並出版《國學輯林》學刊，顧實再撰〈發刊詞〉，他自稱這是接續自己前爲東大《國學叢刊》所寫〈發刊辭〉的繼續，前者僅爲一校而撰，今則意更廣泛。顧氏提出該刊的四項宗旨，即自由研究、普及、溝通中外、注重精神。其論「自由研究」說，思想、言論、學術、出版自由「歐西載在國憲。吾國之人近雖步武隆規，往往自由其名，不自由其實；非政府專制，即輿論專制。以故舊有學術亦萎縮不明。今本會公開破除一切，人人以自由研究爲鵠的，不受何等之束縛」。他在論「普及」時又說，「本會揭櫫普及，絕不受何系統何黨派之挾制」[98]。均明顯表示出防守但不服的態勢，可知此時新派的「系統和黨派」已具「挾制」的能力而形成所謂「輿論專制」，故從事「舊有學術」者不得不以「自由研究」爲依據來「公開破除一切」。將此與前引〈計畫書〉及其招致的批評共觀，可知所謂「國民文學」的不容忍確可殺人於無形，顧

96 ZM，〈顧實先生之妙文〉，《晨報副刊》，1924年4月17日，4版。

97 參見天均，〈評東南大學國學院整理國學計畫書〉，《晨報副刊》，1924年3月30日，4版。

98 本段與下段，顧實，〈發刊詞〉，《國學輯林》，第1期(1926年9月)，頁1-2。

實等顯然深有體會[99]。

在1923年的〈發刊辭〉中，顧實對「溝通中外」有明顯的保留，此時則作正面的提倡說：「學以愈愚，何分國界。徒以舉世拜倒洋學之袴下，遂有國學一名詞之反動。然是研究學術，非爭執意氣。故謂以中學爲主、西學爲輔者，其說非；謂以中學爲體、西學爲用者，其說更非。要在闡揚古昔之典籍，昌明世界之公理，而國學公理二者相與互證而益明。」在後面論「注重精神」時，他又說，世人恒謂「東方之精神文明，西方之物質文明。其實則東方大有物質文明，西方亦有精神文明。而非吾振作固有之精神，則不足以宰制東西之文明，而吾國吾種亦將不免爲某民族之臣虜」。

按顧氏之文化態度顯然與陳寅恪接近(治學取向則大有別)，但留學的陳氏敢於自稱同意中學爲體、西學爲用，顧卻只能表示反對，並不得不標舉趨新者樂道的「學術不分國界」之超越態度，以對抗「舉世拜倒洋學之袴下」的風氣，尤可見其在當時「國民文學」之「輿論專制」下的自我禁抑。

這樣看來，東大國學院與北大國學門之取向有同有異，雖更偏於「抱殘守缺」一流，卻又不同於「冬烘先生之『國學』」，且其對北大派始終取承認和防守的態度。但當時新舊之分在某種程度上已形式化或抽象化，故曹聚仁雖網開一面不提及東大，仍有不少新派人士對其抨擊。新舊形式化或抽象化的一個典型例子是熊十力在1920年春曾致信蔡元培，建議新派放棄「整理舊學之事業」而「專心西學」、大量譯書。羅家倫覆信說，「友人王君來，說先生現在南開學校大學部擔任國文教授，以潛精舊學的國文教授而有這樣積極的思想，謹爲南開前途賀！」

---

99 按顧氏在此次〈發刊詞〉中說「考據家、性理家、詞章家，固有當認為國學之鉅子；然猶有大者，則群經百家之奧義、聖哲英豪之遺型，尤當尊為國學之精神」。這裡對所謂「國學鉅子」與「國學精神」的區分值得注意，既然意在後者，則該會該刊主要並非為了學術上的「自由研究」甚明。

[100] 按熊之來信相當趨新，未必體現其「潛精舊學」，可知這一定語來自「國文教授」這一身分認同，當時國文教授大概以舊派爲主，故兩者竟成同義詞。

但羅家倫顯然讀出了熊十力的言外之意，特別指出「一般老先生以爲我們談新的人就不讀中國書，是錯誤的。不知我們換了一副眼光、換了一套方法來讀中國書，反而可以比他們多找出一點新東西來」。傅斯年稍後說：《山海經》和《楚辭·天問》這類材料以前都是死的，「如無殷墟文字的出土和海寧王〔國維〕君之發明，則敢去用這些材料的，是沒有清楚頭腦的人」，此後再用這些材料者，當然便是「科學」的了[101]。同作一事，頭腦的是否「清楚」可以有這樣大的區別；有了新方法和新眼光的支持，少年氣盛的趨新青年便敢於輕視和貶斥「老先生」了[102]。前引顧頡剛論證同「在故紙堆中作生活」的「我們」與「老學究」的區別，主要依據大概也在此。

而趨新少年輕視比其年長者的風氣也愈演愈烈，創造社的成仿吾就連北大派也不十分承認，他眼中從事國學運動的人有三類：「1. 學者名人而所學有限，乃不得不據國學爲孤城者；2. 老儒宿學及除國學外別無能事乃乘機倡和者；3. 盲從派，這是一切運動所必需之物。這三種人性質雖稍不同。然而他們純襲古人的非科學的舊法，思用以顯耀一時，卻是一樣的。要想取科學的方法爲真切的研究，他們都缺少科學的素養。

100 本段與下段，熊十力致蔡元培，1920年春；羅家倫致熊子真，1920年5月28日，《新潮》，2卷4號(1920年5月)，頁828-829、837-839。

101 傅斯年，〈「新獲卜辭寫本後記」跋〉，《傅斯年全集》(聯經出版公司，1980)，第3冊，頁225。

102 到人生經歷增加而心態也更平和後，羅家倫的觀念也有改變，他晚年說，當年在北大讀書時的「真正國學大師如劉申叔(師培)、黃季剛(侃)、陳伯弢(漢章)幾位先生，也非常之讚賞孟真」(羅家倫，〈元氣淋漓的傅孟真〉，收入王爲松編，《傅斯年印象》〔學林出版社，1997〕，頁3)。這三位治學其實也有不少新方法和新眼光，但在五四前後則是「守舊」的典範。羅氏晚年使用的「真正」二字特別意味深長。

他們的方法與態度，不外是承襲清時的考據家。所以他們縱然碰命研究，充其量不過增加一些從前那無益的考據。」[103] 胡適一向認爲清人的考據也是「科學方法」，則在成氏眼中，胡適或者也被歸入第一類了。可知在新舊區分形式化或抽象化的同時，新與舊本身的涵義又是多層次和多樣化的。

不能算守舊的張東蓀就別有看法，他在1934年強調，「『整理國故』所負的使命實在很大」，即要使中國的固有文化「再發生新芽」以養成中國的民族性。他一方面認爲「這樣整理國故不能望之於只了解舊學的人，因爲我們必須以民族國家主義爲標準來估量一切，當然要屬望於新學有根本的了」；同時又指責當時「一班整理國故的人們完全見不及此，他們把國故當作歐洲學者研究埃及文字與巴比倫宗教一樣看待。簡直把中國文化當作已亡了數千年的骨董來看，所謂國學直是考古學」。這些趨新中國學者仿效外國人研究中國學術的態度，「而美其名曰科學方法。我願說一句過激的話：就是先打倒目下流行的整理國故的態度，然後方可有真正的整理；有了真正的整理方可言有所謂國故，不然全是骨董」[104]。

由於新與舊本身的涵義如此多層次和多樣化，圍繞國學／國故學這一區分新舊的努力很難成功，反倒是整理國故運動部分起到了彌合新舊的實際效果。蓋當時新舊兩派之間在治學上除互相攻擊外其實很少交往，陳訓慈便觀察到，「近來學術界有一不幸之現象，即耆學宿儒往往與新進學者各不相謀」[105]。新舊之間儼然成爲兩個世界，已缺乏溝通的手段，而國故學恰可起到溝通的作用，吳文祺提出：「一般遺老遺少

---

103 成仿吾，〈國學運動的我見〉，《創造周報》，第28號(1923年11月18日)，頁2。

104 張東蓀，〈現代的中國怎樣要孔子？〉，原載《正風半月刊》，收入羅榮渠主編，《從西化到現代化》(北京大學出版社，1990)，頁408-409。

105 叔諒，〈中國之史學運動與地學運動〉，《史地學報》，2卷3號(1923)，頁13。

們，對於西洋的科學，既沒有根柢，又不肯研究。國故學的根本精神，雖然和他們的籠統腦筋格格不入，但材料畢竟是中國的，不致使他們望而卻步。使國故學和他們攜了手，便可以慢慢的改造他們的腦筋了。」106

吳氏此論確有所見，胡適個人就借整理國故「溝通」了許多舊學者。當時的情形是，新派自以為學貫古今中西，「遺老遺少」則似自知其學問所止，不碰非中國的材料。本來區分新舊的努力基本來自各類新派（那時肯自認舊派者已極少見，承認並強調者更是稀見），吳氏則提出一條以溝通而「改造」的新思路。不論排斥還是溝通，採取主動的基本在趨新一邊。新派人物一方面對「國學」、或「國故學」猛烈抨擊，或據西學分類體系剝奪其成「學」的資格，或因怪力亂神和吟壇雅士的存在而貶斥「國學」或「國故學」，否定其正當性。極具詭論意味的是，他們同時又自動擔任「國學」或「國故學」的「學術警察」，排拒怪力亂神、商人、洋場文人、老秀才、蒙館先生、甚至中學國文教師等參與這不成其為「學」的「國學」或「國故學」，說明他們對此其實看得不輕！

總體言之，新派對舊派有意識的否定和排拒遠勝於基本無意識的溝通，故後者的效果多體現在類似胡適這樣的個人而非整體的新舊社群之上。傅斯年在1919年論證以康有為和章太炎為代表的清代學問結束期時指出，「這個時期竟可說是中國近代文化轉移的樞紐。這個以前，是中國的學藝復興時代；這個以後，便要是中國學藝的再造時代。國粹派的主義，當然從此告終；自此以後，必不會再有第一二流的國粹派的學問家」107。中國的學藝由復興進入再造之後，趨新程度不足的國粹派之「學問」也將隨其「主義」的告終而降格至三流以下，相當符合由聽眾

106 吳文祺，〈重新估定國故學之價值〉，《國故學討論集》，第1集，頁49-50。
107 傅斯年，〈清代學問的門徑書幾種〉，《新潮》，1卷4號（1919年4月），頁702。

的接受程度來決定立說者高下的民初世風。

幾年後呂思勉即注意到真舊派已淡出時代的思想言說之中，他發現：「舊時學者，於吾國古書，往往過於尊信。謂西方學術，精者不出吾書；又或曲加附會，謂今世學術，皆昔時所已有。今之人則適相反，熹新者固視國故為土苴，即篤舊者亦謂此中未必真有可取，不過以為舊有之物，不得不從事整治而已。」[108] 這樣，純粹的「舊」學者或已變得半新半舊，或者因與時代不合拍而自我禁抑，退出思想言說的主流。在民初關於「國學」爭論中，已經「落伍」的國粹學派主要人物仍健在，卻基本未曾參與發言，實際恐怕是有所言也無多少人願聽。自庚子義和團之役後，完全回向傳統以尋找光榮和思想資源的主張便幾乎不存在，或存在而基本沒有什麼競爭能力，這次論爭也可視為20世紀中國這一明顯特徵的又一次表現。

國粹學派的基本退出和整理國故提倡者的態度轉變這類思想權勢轉移是「國學」的認同出現問題的重要造因，在尊西趨新和民族主義這兩大20世紀主流趨勢的互動下，從保存國粹到整理國故這一演化進程竟然以不承認國學是「學」為結果，實在意味深長。如果說國學的學科認同危機更多是在思想層面，在學術範圍之內，思想上相當對立且學術取向也頗多歧異的北京大學和東南大學的學人在「國故學即是文化史」一點上的大致共識同樣影響深遠；在這樣的思想與學術互動中，最後還是中國所固有而西方學術分類中也存在的史學被確立下來，「國學」一名終於不立，不得不在反對聲中逐漸淡出思想和學術的主流。

就表述方式言，或可以說許守微1905年凸顯的「國粹與歐化之爭」是從晚清「中西學戰」到民初「中西文化競爭」之間的過渡階段，三者基本同義。今日意義的「文化」概念在清季雖已出現，但得到普遍的認可大約已在新文化運動後期。對一般人而言，國粹、國學、國故這幾個

108 呂思勉，《經子解題》（商務印書館1939年簡編本〔原版於1924年〕），頁102。

名詞在清季民初二、三十年間大致爲許多人互換使用。正是「國學」的淡出進一步確立了「中國文化」這一稱謂的主流地位[109]，此後「學術」的涵義日漸收縮，昔人思考的「學術與國家」的關係到今天已變爲「文化與國家」的關係了。惟「中國文化」也繼承了當年伴隨「國學」的問題：什麼是中國文化、中國文化是否妨礙中國「走向世界」、以及中國文化自身怎樣走向世界乃成爲學術思想界關注、思考和爭辯的問題，雖時隱時顯，仍貫穿了整個20世紀，並帶入21世紀。

109 前引蔡尚思先說「國學便是一國的學術。其在中國，就叫做中國的學術」；接著又說「中國的固有文化，都不能出此國學二字範圍外」。便明顯將「學術」與「文化」替換使用，正體現了兩術語間的轉折和過渡。

胡適的反共思想

周質平
美國普林斯頓大學東亞系教授

前言：反共依然是個禁忌

1950年代初期，中共在全國各階層發動了一個歷時數年的胡適(1891-1962)思想批判運動，此後近30年，只有胡適批判而沒有胡適研究。這個情形，最近20年來，有了相當的改變。不但胡適著作在大陸重新出版，而且有關的傳記和研究也隨著政策的開放，而日見其多。胡適研究在中國大陸居然很有成爲「顯學」的趨勢。但這並不表示胡適的著作和研究全無禁區。在現有大陸出版的胡適著作中，以1998年由北京大學出版社出版歐陽哲生所編的《胡適文集》12冊，及胡明主編，由光明日報出版社出版的《胡適精品集》16冊爲最全，但胡適晚年所寫重要的反共文字多未收入[1]，而所有大陸所出有關胡適的研究著作，對胡適思

1 如1950年由香港自由中國出版社出版的《我們必須選擇我們的方向》一書中所收九篇文字，除〈自由主義〉一文，收入《胡適文集》第12冊《胡適演講集》(文句小有異同)外，其餘8篇都未收入。《胡適精品集》所收反共文字稍多，但仍不全。

想中反共的部分不是輕描淡寫，就是痛下批判。因此，胡適的反共思想在大陸始終沒有得到全面的展現和受到公平的對待。

這個情形也相當程度的反映在台灣和海外的胡適研究上。形成這一現象的主要原因並不是政治上的忌諱，而是胡適重要的反共言論大多是1949年以後以英文發表的。這些英文發表的演講和文章翻譯成中文的只是少數，而有些講稿並未正式出版，搜求就更爲困難了。

胡適著作在中國重新出版的重要意義正在於他的思想至今仍有違礙的地方，而這點違礙也正是「胡適幽靈」精神之所在。胡適晚年所寫文字有不少是早年作品的摘要或復述，他的反共言論卻是他晚年的「新作」。在這個新世紀伊始，而共產主義式微之際，來審視胡適——共產黨當年的死敵——的反共思想，我們特別能感到自由民主畢竟是擋不住的世界潮流。

至今，中國大陸的學者，還有不少以「小資產階級的軟弱性」來批評胡適與當道在鬥爭中的容忍態度，談到胡適的反共，則不假思索的用些「反動」等不堪的字眼加諸其身。其實，胡適的「反動」，正是他的進步；胡適的「反動」，正是他的鬥爭、他的不妥協；胡適的「反動」，也正是他的思想對21世紀的中國人來說，依舊光焰萬丈之所在。

胡適反共思想的哲學基礎

就胡適思想整體而言，「反共」並不是它的「體」，而只是它的「用」。換句話說，一種反對意見的提出，必然是在一個人的基本信仰受到威脅或挑戰以後，被動的，甚至於是不得已的一種舉措。所以要了解胡適的反共思想，必須先審視他思想體系中有那些基本信念或價值取向是和共產主義不兩立的。在有了這樣的理解之後，我們才能知道胡適的反共，絕不僅僅是他個人政治立場的表示，更重要的是在反共中體現了他的自由主義，人道主義和他對廣大眾生的悲憫。這種悲憫是來自「抗爭」，而不

是「容忍」。胡適一生服膺杜威(John Dewey, 1859-1952)的實驗主義，在社會改造上，反對徹底通盤「畢其功於一役」的革命，不相信有「包醫百病的根本解決」，而主張一點一滴的改良。這個基本信念，早在1919年「問題與主義」的辯論中即已明白的表示出來[2]。胡適經常引用杜威的一句話是：「進步不是全盤的，而是零星的，是由局部來進行的。」(Progress is not a wholesale matter, but a retail job, to be contracted for and excuted in section.)[3] 這種溫和的改良態度是胡適和李大釗(1889-1927)，陳獨秀(1880-1942)等左派知識分子最大不同之所在，也是《新青年》團體在「問題與主義」論爭之後，分化成左右兩個營壘的根本原因。共產黨的革命主張用暴力的手段，做翻天覆地式的徹底改變，這恰是胡適主張的反面。這點基本態度的不同是胡適日後反共的哲學基礎。

1930年3月10日，胡適寫〈漫遊的感想〉，他說：「美國是不會有社會革命的，因為美國天天在社會革命之中。這種革命是漸進的，天天有進步，故天天是革命。」[4] 同年4月13日，寫《我們走那條路》，進一步的表示了他反對暴力的革命：

> 中國今日需要的，不是那用暴力專制而製造革命的革命，也不是那用暴力推翻暴力的革命，也不是那懸空捏造革命對象因而用來鼓吹革命的革命。在這一點上，我們寧可不避「反革命」之名，而不能主張這種種革命[5]。

---

2 參看，胡適，〈問題與主義〉，《胡適文存》(台北：遠東，1968)，共4冊，冊1，頁342-379。以下所引《胡適文存》如未特別注明版本，即指遠東版。

3 Quoted from Hu Shih, "The Conflict of Ideologies," in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*(November, 1941), vol. 218. p. 32.收入周質平編，《胡適英文文存》(台北：遠流，1995)，共3冊，冊2，頁885-896。

4 胡適，〈漫遊的感想〉，《胡適文存》，第3集，頁29。

5 胡適，〈我們走那條路〉，《胡適文存》，第4集，頁14。

胡適早在康乃爾大學留學時期，就反對急於求成的革命，在他看來，任何急進和暴力的革命，都不免是表面的，短暫的，是只有破壞而沒有建設的，因此也就成了一種浪費。他畢生所鼓吹的是：社會改革是沒有捷徑的，是必須從基礎做起的[6]。

1941年7月8日，胡適在美國密西根大學講《意識形態的衝突》(The Conflict of Ideologies)，他明確的指出「激進的革命與點滴的改良」(radical revolution versus piecemeal reform)是獨裁與民主的根本不同之所在：「獨裁政權的首要特徵是他們都支持激進並帶有災難性的革命，而他們對特定的改革則譏之爲膚淺而無用。」(The first basic characteristic of totalitarian regimes is that they all stand for radical catastrophic revolution and that they all scorn and spurn specific reforms as superficial and useless.)[7] 1954年3月5日，胡適在《自由中國》社歡迎茶會上講〈從《到奴役之路》說起〉，又提到了他在13年前所寫的這篇文章，並引了其中的一句話：「一切的所謂社會徹底改革的主張，必然的要領導到政治的獨裁。」(All social radicalism must inevitably lead to political dictatorship)並引了一句列寧的話「革命是最獨裁的東西」(Revolution is undoubtedly the most authoritarian thing in the world.)[8] 可見直到晚年，胡適沒有改變過他在〈問題與主義〉中的基本信念。

胡適思想中反共的另一個基本成分是他的個人主義。在個體與群體的關係中，他一方面強調個體需爲群體服務，個體的生命必須透過群體才能達到不朽[9]；但另一方面，他絕不抹殺個體的獨立性和特殊性[10]。換言之，群體絕不允許假任何名義，對個體的獨立性和特殊性進行壓

6 胡適，1916年1月31日日記，《胡適留學日記》(台北：商務，1973)，共4冊，冊3，頁842-843。

7 Hu Shih, "The Conflict of Ideologies," p. 31.

8 胡適，〈從《到奴役之路》說起〉，《自由中國》，10卷6期(1954, 3, 16)，頁5。

9 參看，胡適，〈不朽〉，《胡適文存》，第1集，頁693-702。

10 參看，胡適，〈易卜生主義〉，同上，頁629-647。

迫。「多樣並存，各自發展」是胡適思想中的一個重要信念。任何違背這一信念的主義和教條都在他反對之列。他在〈意識形態的衝突〉一文中，指出獨裁集權與自由民主的另一個思想上的衝突是「一致與多樣」(uniformity versus diversity)的不同。他說：「民主方式的生活基本上是個人主義的。」(The democratic way of life is essentially individualistic) 他認為：

> 嚴格的要求一致必然導致對個人自發性的壓迫，阻礙個性的發展和創造性的努力，導致不容忍，迫害，和奴役，而最糟的是導致知識上的不誠實和道德上的偽善。
> The desire for uniformity leads to suppression of individaul initiative, to the dwarfing of personality and creative effort, to intolerance, oppression, and slavery, and, worst of all, to intellectual dishonesty and moral hypocrisy.[11]

1949年以後的中國正是極端的要求一致而不允許任何人有獨立的思考和自由的意志，胡適在這段話中所指出的種種問題，在中共的獨裁政權之下顯得特別真實。

1955年，胡適寫〈四十年來中國文藝復興運動留下的抗暴消毒力量——中國共產黨清算胡適思想的歷史意義〉，對民主的精義有極其獨到的解釋，最可以看出胡適思想中個體與群體關係：「民主的生活方式，在政治制度上的表現，好像是少數服從多數，其實他的最精彩的一點是多數不抹殺少數，不敢不尊重少數，更不敢壓迫少數，毀滅少數。」[12]

---

11 Hu Shih, "The Conflict of Ideologies," p. 34.

12 胡適，〈四十年來中國文藝復興運動留下的抗暴消毒力量——中國共產黨清算胡適思想的歷史意義〉，收入《胡適手稿》，第九集(台北：胡適紀念館，1970)，頁548。

胡適一生除了鼓吹自由民主之外，同時提倡懷疑的態度，要人們不輕信任何沒有證據的東西。他在《三論問題與主義》中的名句是：

> 一切主義，一切學理，都該研究，但是只可認作一些假設的見解，不可認作天經地義的信條；只可認作參考印證的材料，不可奉為金科玉律的宗教；只可用作啓發心思的工具，切不可用作蒙蔽聰明，停止思想的絕對眞理[13]。

在二，三十年代，胡適對馬克思主義和社會主義的批評主要並不是在內容上，而是在提倡者的武斷，和追隨著的盲從上。1922年，他在〈我的歧路〉中指出：

> 我對於現今的思想文藝，是很不滿意的。孔丘，朱熹的奴隸減少了，卻添了一班馬克思，克洛泡特金的奴隸；陳腐的古典主義打倒了，卻換上了種種淺薄的新典主義[14]。

1930年，胡適寫〈介紹我自己的思想〉，類似的話又重說了一次：「被孔丘、朱熹牽著鼻子走，固然不算高明；被馬克思、列寧、斯大林牽著鼻子走，也算不得好漢」[15]。這些話雖然說得很嚴厲，但都不是針對馬列思想的本身，而是針對信仰者的態度而言。1953年，胡適把這種不輕信權威的懷疑態度視爲共產黨批判胡適思想的主要原因之一[16]。
胡適一生沒有接受過馬克思的經濟理論，所謂生產方式是決定歷史發展

---

13 胡適，〈三論問題與主義〉，《胡適文存》，第一集，頁373。
14 胡適，〈我的歧路〉，《胡適文存》，第2集(合肥：黃山書社，1996)，卷3，頁333。
15 胡適，〈介紹我自己的思想〉，《胡適文存》，第4集，頁624。
16 胡適，〈同情淪陷鐵幕的知識分子——對大陸文化教育界人士廣播〉，在《胡適作品集》(台北：遠流，1986)，共37冊，冊26，頁209-210。

最後和最主要的原因，在胡適看來，這至多不過是一個未經「小心求證」的「大膽假設」。胡適對歷史發展的解釋，始終強調偶然，多元，而不認爲有最後和唯一的解釋。這種偶然說的形成早在他幼時讀《資治通鑑》，讀到范縝《神滅論》時，即已種下因子[17]。這一點思想的種子影響了他一生的「思想行事」[18]，使他不能輕易的接受對歷史發展所作一元的解釋。胡適並沒有寫過專論歷史發展的文字，但從他零星的論述中是可以理出一個頭緒來的。

1927年1月25日，胡適和著名的美國史學家比爾德(Charles A.Beard, 1874-1948)談到歷史發展的問題，在日記中，有比較詳細的記錄，很可以看出胡適對這一問題所持的觀點：

> 歷史上有許多事是起於偶然的，個人的嗜好，一時的錯誤，無意的碰巧，皆足以開一新局面。當其初起時，誰也不注意。以後越走越遠，回視作始之時，幾同隔世[19]。

胡適向比爾德提出歷史的偶然說卻絕不偶然，比爾德以寫《美國憲法的經濟闡釋》(*An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*)一書而著名一時，他是偏向於從經濟的觀點來解釋歷史發展的學者[20]。因此胡適的偶然說是針對馬克思的唯物史觀而提出的。

1935年，胡適寫《中國新文學大系》的〈導言〉，對歷史發展一元

17 參看，《資治通鑑》(北京：中華，1956)，共20冊，卷136，在冊9，頁4259；胡適，《四十自述》(台北：遠東，1982)，頁42-43。
18 胡適，〈不朽〉，《胡適文存》，1集，頁700。
19 《胡適的日記手稿本》(台北：遠流，1990)，共18冊，第6冊，無頁碼。
20 Charles A. Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (New York:The Macmillan Company, 1939). Max Lerner, "Carles Beard's Political Theory," In Howard K. Beale ed., *Charles A. Beard: An Appraisal*(University of Kentucky Press, 1954), pp. 25-45.

的解釋，提出了批評：

> 治歷史的人，應該向傳記材料裡去尋求那多元的，個別的因素，而不應該走偷懶的路，妄想用一個「最後之因」來解釋一切歷史事實。無論你抬出來的「最後之因」是「神」，是「性」，是「心靈」，或是「生產方式」，都可以解釋一切歷史。但是，正因為個個「最後之因」都可以解釋一切歷史，所以都不能解釋任何歷史了！……所以凡可以解釋一切歷史的「最後之因」，都是歷史學者認為最無用的玩意兒，因為他們其實都不能解釋什麼具體的歷史事實[21]。

馬克思的經濟史觀，在1920年代，被許多中國知識分子認爲是歷史發展的科學解釋，也是唯一解釋。接受這個理論，往往是信仰共產主義的先決條件。胡適根本不承認歷史發展的一元解釋，就更不必說接受馬克思的經濟史觀了。

胡適實驗主義的態度一方面使他不能相信有包醫百病的萬應靈丹；但另一方面，也因爲這種「有幾分證據說幾分話」的科學態度，使他不能在社會主義還沒有確切實驗結果之前就妄下判斷。1926年，胡適發表〈我們對於近代西洋文明的態度〉，對社會主義有過極高的評價，他說：

> 18世紀的新宗教信條是自由，平等，博愛。19世紀中葉以後的新宗教信條是社會主義。這是西洋近代的精神文明，這是東方民族不曾有過的精神文明[22]。

21 胡適，〈導言〉，在趙家璧主編《中國新文學大系》(上海：良友，1935)，共10冊，冊1，《建設理論集》，頁17。

22 胡適，〈我們對於近代西洋文明的態度〉，《胡適文存》，冊3，頁10。

這個態度和他1917年在美國留學時初聞俄國革命時的歡快心情是類似的。他當時認爲「新俄之未來」是「未可限量的」，並曾有「拍手高歌，新俄萬歲」的詩句[23]。

1954年，胡適對自己27年前對社會主義的高度評價有過「公開的懺悔」[24]。當然，這個「公開懺悔」也是胡適對社會主義的「晚年定論」。

胡適一點一滴溫和的改良主義，主張多樣並存，發展自我的個人主義，不輕信任何權威的懷疑精神，對歷史發展多元偶然的解釋，這種種都使胡適思想與共產主義格格不入。這些哲學上的基本信念是胡適反共思想的基礎。

對共產勢力的錯估與低估

胡適對共產黨在中國的發展，有過一段時間的低估和錯估。在1928年5月18日的日記裡，記了他和吳稚暉的一段談話，吳稚暉認爲：「共產黨要大得志一番，中國還免不了殺人放火之劫」。胡適「卻不這麼想」[25]。1953年11月24日，胡適寫〈追念吳稚暉先生〉又重提了這件25年前的舊事，承認自己的錯誤，佩服吳稚暉的遠見[26]。

直到抗戰勝利，胡適還懷著一種天真的想法，希望毛澤東能放棄武力，與國民黨合作，在中國成立一個兩黨政治。1945年8月24日，胡適從紐約發了一個電報給當時在重慶的毛澤東，力陳此意：

> 潤之先生：頃見報載，傅孟眞轉述兄問候胡適之語，感念舊

23 參看胡適，《胡適留學日記》(台北：商務，1963)，共4冊，冊4，頁1132。
24 胡適，〈從《到奴役之路》〉說起，《自由中國》，第10卷6期，頁4-5。
25 《胡適的日記手稿本》，冊7。
26 胡適，〈追念吳稚暉先生〉，《自由中國》，10卷1期(1954, 1, 1)，頁6。

> 好，不勝馳念。二十二日晚與董必武兄長談，適陳鄙見，以為中共領袖諸公，今日宜審察世界形勢，愛惜中國前途，努力忘卻過去，瞻望將來，痛下決心，放棄武力，為中國建立一個不靠武力的第二政黨。公等若能有此決心，則國內十八年之糾紛一朝解決 而公等二十餘年之努力，皆可不致因內戰而完全消滅。美國開國之初，吉佛生十餘年和平奮鬥，其所創之民主黨遂於第四屆大選獲得政權。英國工黨五十年前僅得四萬四千票，而和平奮鬥之結果，今年得一千二百萬票，成為絕大多數黨。若能持之耐心毅力，將來和平發展，前途未可限量。萬萬不可以小不忍而自致毀滅[27]！

從這通電報最可以看出胡適在政治上的天真，和他「不可救藥的樂觀主義者」的個性。1954年，他爲司徒雷登(John Leighton Stuart, 1876-1962)的回憶錄《旅華五十年》(*Fifty Years in China*)寫前言(Introduction)時對馬歇爾(Marshall)和曾任美國駐中國大使的司徒雷登有所批評，認爲馬歇爾所主張的國共和談是個實現不了的空想(The Marshall Mission failed because of its inherently impossible objectives)但胡適同時指出當時他自己和司徒雷登是同樣的幼稚：

> 其實，在那理想主義橫溢的年代裡，我也是一個國內事物和國際政治上的生手。我竟然如此天真，在日本投降後不久，發了一通長電到重慶轉交給我從前的學生毛澤東，嚴肅而又誠懇的向他說明，現在日本既已投降，共產黨已沒有任何理由繼續維持一個龐大的私人部隊……當然，我至今沒有收到回音。

---

27 這一電稿收入胡頌平，《胡適之先生年譜長編初稿》(臺北：聯經，1984)，共10冊，冊5，頁1894-1985。

> In fact I, too, was just as naive a tyro in national and international politics in those days of expansive idealism. So naive, indeed, was I that shortly after V-J Day I sent a lengthy radiogram to Chungking to be forwarded to my former student Mao Tse-tung, solemnly and earnestly pleading with him that, now that Japan had surrendered, there was no more justification for the Chinese Communists to continue to maintain a huge private army...... Of course, to this day I have never received a reply.[28]

直到1947年胡適才真正感到共產黨在世界上對自由民主所造成的威脅，在〈兩種根本不同的政黨〉一文中，把「俄國的共產黨」，「意大利的法西斯黨」和「德國的納粹黨」歸爲同一類的政黨。並指出：這類政黨「有嚴密的組織」，「黨員沒有自由」，「有特務偵察機關」，監視人民的言論，思想和行動。「他們不惜用任何方式取得政權；既得政權之後不惜用任何方法鞏固政權，霸住政權」。這類政黨「絕對不承認，也不容許反對黨的存在。一切反對力量，都是反動，都必須徹底肅清鏟除。」雖然，胡適在這篇文章中所描述的並不是中國共產黨，而是俄國共產黨，但是在這篇文章發表兩年以後，取得政權的中國共產黨，其獨裁與集權卻更遠甚於胡適所說[29]。我相信胡適在寫這篇文章時，已清楚的感到共產黨在中國已是「山雨欲來，風滿樓」的形勢了。

1947年8月1日，也就是在〈兩種根本不同的政黨〉發表之後12天，胡適在北平中央廣播電台，廣播〈眼前世界文化的趨向〉，他明白的指

---

28 Hu Shih, "Introduction," to John Leighton Stuart's *Fifty Years in China*(New York: Random House, 1954), p. xix. 收入《胡適英文文存》，冊3，頁1446。胡適這通電報是1945年8月24日發的。日本正式投降的日子是1945年9月2日。胡適在寫前言時，在時間上也許誤記了。

29 胡適，〈兩種根本不同的政黨〉，在《我們必須選擇我們的方向》（香港：自由中國出版社，1950），頁3。

出：

> 我是學歷史的人，從歷史上來看世界文化上的趨向，那是民主自由的趨向，是三四百年來的一個最大目標，一個明白的方向。最近三十年的反自由，反民主的集體專制的潮流，在我個人看來，不過是一個小小的波折，一個小小的逆流。我們可以不必因為中間起了這一個三十年的逆流，抹殺那三百年的民主大潮流，大方向[30]。

這個時候，胡適已清楚的感覺到這股「反自由，反民主」的逆流逼人而來了。胡適發表這篇文章，也無非是在逼人的逆流之下，希望大家對民主自由維持住信心，但他似乎還沒估計到這股逆流竟能在兩年之後席捲中國。

在〈眼前世界文化的趨向〉發表之後23天，胡適又寫了〈我們必須選擇我們的方向〉一文。在文末，他語重心長的呼籲：

> 我們中國人在今日必須認清世界文化的大趨勢，我們必須選定我們自己應該走的方向。只有自由可以解放我們民族的精神，只有民主政治可以團結全民的力量來解決全民族的困難，只有自由民主可以給我們培養一個有人味的文明社會[31]。

這是胡適在反自由，反民主的逆流席捲中國的前夕，所作再一次的努力。但終究是言者諄諄而聽者藐藐，兩年以後中國人作出的選擇恰是胡適誘導的反面。

---

30 胡適，〈眼前世界文化的趨向〉，《我們必須選擇我們的方向》，頁11。
31 胡適，〈我們必須選擇我們的方向〉，同上，頁17。

1948年3月21日，胡適在給周鯁生的長信中，表示了他對蘇聯徹底的失望，並指出：「戰後的蘇聯可能是一個很可怕的侵略勢力。……可能比德國日本還更可怕」。雅爾達密約簽訂之後，使胡適「不能不承認有一大堆冷酷的事實，不能不拋棄我二十多年對新俄的夢想。」[32]

從上引胡適1947和1948年發表的四篇文字來看，他的心情真是一篇緊似一篇。雖然他已經清楚的指出共產黨所代表的是集權專制和侵略，但他的批評卻始終是圍繞著國際共產黨或蘇聯共產黨，而未及中國共產黨一字。這絕不是他還沒看出中國共產黨有奪取政權的野心和企圖，而是他仍然想在國共兩黨的鬥爭中，保持一定的超然。作爲一個無黨派自由主義者，他仍然對兩黨政治懷著一定的夢想。胡適對中國共產黨的直接批評是在1949年以後。

從思想史上反共

「反共」是胡適晚年思想中極重要的一部分，也是他的一個新使命。在一篇大約是1955年手寫的中文殘稿中，胡適把原來擬好的題目〈胡適是應該被清算的〉改成〈我是根本反共的〉[33]。雖然這只是一篇殘稿的題目，但卻很有意義。顯然胡適認爲「反共」是他「根本」的態度。他對這個態度不但不迴避，而且以此自任。

1955年，也正是批判胡適思想進入最高潮的時候。胡適寫了〈四十

32 胡適，〈國際形勢裡的兩個問題——給周鯁生先生的一封信〉，同上，頁19-23。

33 這篇不到一頁的殘稿藏台北中央研究院胡適紀念館(以下稱「紀念館」)編號為「7-413美國一」寫了下面這段話：

「自從去年11月以來，大陸上的共產黨報紙發表了許多篇批判胡適思想的文字。有幾篇是我的老朋友或老學生寫的。我早就說過，在共產黨的統治之下，人民沒有說話的自由，也沒有不說話的自由。所以我的老朋友被逼迫寫的罵我或批評我的文字，我看了只感覺同情的惋嘆，誠心的諒解，決沒有絲毫的責怪。」

年來中國文藝復興運動留下的抗暴消毒力量——中國共產黨清算胡適思想的歷史意義〉長文。在這篇文章中，他指出：「我在這三十多年之中，從沒有發表過一篇批評或批判馬克思主義的文字」。然而，在批胡運動中，胡適卻被認定是「馬克思主義的死敵」，「馬克思主義戰線上最主要，最狡猾的敵人」，「企圖從根本上拆毀馬克思主義的基礎」，周揚則宣稱胡適是「中國馬克思主義和社會主義思想的最早的，最堅決的，不可調和的敵人」[34]。這些「罪名」，或許也曾聳動一時，但現在看來卻成了胡適在中國近現代思想史上偉大的業績了。胡適不但是反共的，而且是共產黨思想上的頭號敵人！

胡適的反共是從兩個層面來進行的。其一是從他終身研究的中國哲學史中，來闡發自老子以來的自然主義與以孔子爲代表的理性人文主義，是幾千年來中國思想的正宗和基底。這個崇尙自然和理性的思想基本上是反獨裁，反暴力的，任何帶著宗教狂熱的迷信和暴力都不能輕易征服中國知識分子的心。這個理性的人文主義不但是佛教和基督教在中國遇到的最大阻力，也是共產黨獨裁和思想控制所遇到的「抗暴防腐」力量。

在一篇50年代所寫題爲〈共產主義、民主與文化形態〉(Communism Democracy, and Culture Pattern)的英文打字稿中，胡適提出了一個問題：在共產黨的統治之下，中國思想和文化之中有沒有什麼成分是集權和暴力所不能摧毀的，而這個成分終將成爲推翻暴政的最後力量。作爲一個終身從事中國思想史和文化史的研究者，他認爲至少以下三點能有效而且長期的抵抗共產主義：

1)一種近乎無政府主義對所有政府干預的極度厭惡。

34 參看胡適，〈四十年來中國文藝復興運動留下的抗暴消毒力量——中國共產黨清算胡適思想的歷史意義〉，收入《胡適手稿》，第9集(台北：胡適紀念館，1970)，頁493-495。

2)一種愛好自由與為自由而戰的悠久傳統——尤其是對知識，宗教和政治批評的自由。

3)傳統對個人權利和對懷疑態度的推崇——即使是對最神聖的事物的懷疑。

1)An almost anarchistic aversion for all government interference.

2)A long traditon of love for freedom and fight for freedom, --especially for intellectual freedom and religious freedom, but also for the freedom of political criticism.

3)A traditional exaltation of the individual's right to doubt and question things-even the most sacred things.

胡適用《老子》的自由放任與漢初的「無爲」政治來說明第一點。共產黨的集權統治是中國兩千年來「天高皇帝遠」無爲傳統的反面。50年代的共產黨幹部深入到村莊裡的每一戶人家，從食物上的控制進而干預到言談舉止，甚至於生活上的每一個細節。胡適寫道：

> 我不相信由有意識的哲學與兩千年來無意識的生活方式所培養灌輸而成的根深柢固的個人主義與無政府主義的心態，可以在幾個月，甚至於幾年之內，就被無所不在的極權統治所肅清。
> I cannot believe this inveterate individualistic and anarchistic mentality inculcated by conscious philosophy and especially by 20 centuries of unconscious living could be liquidated by a few months or even a few years of all-pervading totalitarian rule.

說到第二點「愛好自由的傳統」，胡適用先秦諸子，百家爭鳴的歷史來作爲例子，並引了《論語》「士不可以不弘毅，任重而道遠。仁以爲己任，不亦重乎？死而後已，不亦遠乎？」和《孟子》：「自任以天

下之重」來說明中國知識分子兩千多年來所形成的使命感。一種「天下興亡，匹夫有責」的責任感，使知識分子不能坐視一個政權過分偏離道德和理性。

至於第三點，胡適用歷代敢於直言的忠臣義士來說明在「理」與「勢」的鬥爭中，政治權勢或可有一時之披靡，但「理」終將得到最後的勝利[35]。

我們今天重讀這篇胡適寫在50年代的英文舊作，或許覺得他未免高估了中國傳統思想中無為放任和追求自由的力量，把古代的哲學思想看作了抵抗強權和暴政的武器，而同時又低估了共產政權藉著現代的科技，在控制人民思想上，有前人意想不到的效率。試看1957年反右之後和文化大革命10年之中，中國知識分子所受到的磨難真是空前悲慘。至少到目前為止，我們還看不到這個自先秦以來即深植人心的自由傳統，在反抗強權和暴力上，可曾起過多少作用。

然而從這個角度來批評胡適的看法，也許是過分短視的。共產黨統治中國不過50年，以50年與3000年相比，則50年只是一瞬。一個史學家和哲學家所能看到的往往是一般人所不及見的。胡適爭的是「千秋」，不是「朝夕」。我們不能因為共產黨對知識分子摧殘迫害之一時得勢，就輕易懷疑幾千年傳統的失去作用。

在中國受到強權侵凌，和中國知識分子受到暴力摧殘的時候，胡適常以英文發表文章闡述中國歷代思想中自由民主和科學的傳統。1941年正當中國抗日進入最困難的時期，時任駐美大使的胡適，發表英文論文〈民主中國的歷史基礎〉(Historical Foundations for a Democratic China)，他從社會學和史學的觀點來說明民主這個概念對中國人並不是全然陌生的，它有一定本土的根，他特別提出三點作為民主的歷史基礎：

35 Hu Shih, "Communism, Democracy and Culture Pattern," 原稿藏紀念館，編號為「6-18，美國一」。

1)徹底平民化的社會結構；

2)兩千年來客觀的考試任官制度；

3)歷代的政府創立了一種來自本身的批評和監察的制度。

First, a thoroughly democratized social structure; secondly, 2000 years of an objective and competitive system of examinations for civil service; and thirdly, the historic institution of the government creating its own "opposition" and censorial control.[36]

胡適提出的三點是否能視爲中國民主的基礎容或有可以商榷的地方[37]，但胡適希望爲民主找到一個中國思想的根，這個用心是顯而易見的。從思想的根源上來說明暴力和獨裁之不適用於中國是胡適從學術研究上來進行反共。

1954年，胡適在第六屆遠東學會年會發表英文論文〈中國古代思想中懷疑的權利〉(The Right to Doubt in Ancient Chinese Thought)。他把自老子以來的自然主義和孔子「未能事人，焉能事鬼」的人本懷疑精神，以至於漢朝王充在《論衡》中所提倡「疾虛妄」的求真態度，都視爲中國民主思想的根源，他把1949年以後共產黨在中國大陸的集權統治叫做「由軍事上的征服所帶來暫時的野蠻」(temporary barbarization brought by military conquest)他在文末充滿信心的說：

中國這種懷疑的精神，這種智識上與生俱來的懷疑與批評的權利，最後終能把中國從目前暫時的野蠻境況中解救出來。

36 Hu Shih, "Historical Foundations for a Democratic China," in *Edmund J. James on Government: Second Series*(Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1941), pp. 1-12. 收入《胡適英文文存》，冊2，頁867-878。

37 有關對這三點的討論，參看周質平，〈胡適對民主的闡釋〉，收入《胡適叢論》(台北：三民，1992)，頁35-62。

I may also add that it will be this Chinese spirit of doubt-this Chinese intellectual birthright to doubt and criticize-that may yet ultimately save China from her present state of temporary barbarization.[38]

從上引的這幾段話中，我們可以看出：胡適把自先秦以來的自然主義和人本主義看作抵禦強暴最後的，也是最有效的辦法。胡適在死前不到兩年所寫的一篇重要的英文論文〈中國的傳統與未來〉(The Chinese Tradition and the Future)中，充滿信心的說：「這個『人本主義與理性主義的中國』的傳統並不曾遭到摧毀，也是在任何情況下都毀滅不了的。」(I believe the tradition of the "humanistic and rationalistic China" has not been destroyed and in all probability cannot be destroyed.)[39]

這種從思想史上追根溯源的反共作法，可以解釋爲胡適在文化上的民族主義。論者談到民族主義往往只注意到它的政治意義而忽略了它的文化內涵。在我看來，文化認同才是民族主義的最後歸宿。胡適在前引〈共產主義，民主與文化形態〉一文中，把共產黨的獨裁稱作「非中國式的非理性與暴力的獨裁」("un-Chinese" dictatorship of unreason and violence)。在這句話裡，「非中國的」這個詞是特別值得注意的。換句話說，1949年以後的共產黨暴力集權統治，是不符合中國傳統，而且沒有「中國特色」的。而胡適自五四時期以來所倡導的自由民主和科學，從歷史上追溯，反倒是符合中國國情的。

無論胡適曾經如何激烈的批判過中國文化，指出中國文化中不人道

38 Hu Shih, "The Right to Doubt in Ancient Chinese Thought," in *Philosophy East and West*(January 1963), vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 295-299. 收入《胡適英文文存》，冊3，頁1449-1456。

39 Hu Shih, "The Chinese Tradition and the Future," in *Sino-American Conference on Intellectual Cooperation: Reports and Proceedings*(University of Washington, Department of Publications and Printing, 1962), p. 22.《胡適英文文存》，冊3，頁1578。

的禮教桎梏，但這種種都絲毫不影響他對這個文化的依戀和愛護，他一生的工作和努力是和中國前途分不開的。如果我們將「中國」這個成分從「胡適」這個名詞中抽離，「胡適」立即成了一個虛幻。胡適的功也好，過也好，唯有在「中國」這個大前提之下，才有意義。胡適始終不是一個鮮明或典型的民族主義者，但他畢生爲中國前途和中國人民的民主與自由而作出的貢獻卻又遠在一般典型的民族主義者之上。

胡適在他晚年所寫文章中所再三致意的是，以自然主義與人本思想爲基底的中國傳統是反對一切狂熱和一切暴力的，而1949年以後，共產黨的統治，卻又是在狂熱和暴力這兩點上表現的特別突出。因此，共產集權統治的最後敵人正是這個悠久的傳統。

對中共政權的直接批評

除了從思想史上指出獨裁暴力不適合於中國國情之外，胡適反共的另一個方式是對中共政權直接的批評。1949年以後，胡適對中共政權從未有過任何幻想，他自始就清楚的知道共產黨當權之後，絕無民主自由之可言。在一篇1950年11月所寫題爲〈自由世界需要一個自由的中國〉(The Free World Needs A Free China)的英文講稿中，胡適指出1949年的政權轉移不但使全體中國老百姓失去了自由，就是中共政權的本身也失去了自由。他在文中指出：

> 不只是中國人不自由。更重要的是自由世界要了解中國政權本身也是不自由的。毛澤東，中國共產黨，還有整個中國共產政府都是不自由的：他們都在蘇聯所加於它衛星國的枷鎖之下。他們一向是聽命於克里姆林宮的，因為他們深知共產中國會繼續依賴蘇聯軍事和工業的力量，所以他們必須繼續聽命於克里

姆林宮[40]。

But it is not the Chinese people alone who are not free. It is more important for the free world to understand that the Chinese regime itself is not free. Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Communist Party, and the entire Chinese Communist Government are not free: they are all under the bondage, which the USSR imposes on the satellite countries. They have always taken orders from the Kremlin, and they must continue to take such orders because they are fully conscious that Communist China has been and will long continue to be dependent on the military and industrial power of the Soviet Union.

在這篇文章中，胡適對「自由的中國」一詞特別有所說明，他所說「自由的中國」並非僅指當時的台灣　而是相對「受制於蘇聯的中國」而言。他對這一詞的界定是：

> 我所說的「自由的中國」是指極大多數的中國人雖然生活在鐵幕之中，受難於鐵索之下，但是他們在心智上和感情上都是反共的。
>
> By "Free China", I mean the vast majority of the Chinese people who are mentally and emotionally anti-Communist even though they are physically living and suffering under the iron yoke and behind the Iron Curtain.

在文末，胡適堅定的指出：

---

40 這篇英文稿藏紀念館，編號為「6-1 10美國一」。有胡適手改的筆跡。

自由的中國的存在是個事實，目前在所有被世界共產主義征服的民族中，中國人是文明最高的，他們生活在一個以個人主義知名，千百年來為知識，宗教和政治自由而戰的文明裡。我的同胞不能長期的受制〔於共產集權〕。

這不是一個被稱之為中國不可救藥的樂觀主義的哲學家一廂情願的想法。這個結論是一個終生研究中國思想和歷史的學者經過仔細研究所作頭腦清楚的判斷。要是歷史和文明不完全是荒謬的，那麼，自由的中國就將永存[41]。

Free China exits as a reality because, of all the peoples conquered by World Communism so far my people are the most civilized and have lived under a civilization noted for its individualism and its century-long fights for intellectual, religious and political freedom. My people cannot long remain captive.

This is no wishful thinking on the part of a Chinese philosopher who has been called the incurable optimist of China. No, this conclusion is the studied sober judgement of a life-long student of Chinese thought and history. If history and civilization means anything at all, there shall always be a free China.

胡適在這篇文章中所說的「自由的中國」並不是一個政治實體，而是中國人長久以來所養成的爲自由而戰的傳統精神。歷史和文明終究不會是完全荒謬的，任何暴政和集權都不能永遠的壓制住人民爭取自由的意願。胡適對這個歷史的通則是絲毫沒有任何懷疑的。

1949年10月1日之後，多少海外中國知識分子對毛澤東「中國人民站起來了」這句話充滿了浪漫的幻想，爲建設社會主義的新中國而紛紛

41 同上。

回國，這些熱情熱血的愛國青年，在往後幾年的清算鬥爭之中，幾乎無一倖免。他們的愛國熱誠是可敬的，但是對共產黨天真浪漫的想法，卻是可憫的。

當時對共產黨的革命抱持天真浪漫想法的也不只是中國知識分子而已，試看日後成爲美國近代中國研究領袖人物的費正清(John King Fairbank, 1907-1991)在1982年出版的回憶錄，《中國行：五十年的回憶》(*Chinabound: A Fifty Year Memoir*)，在〈發現左翼〉(Discovering the Left)一章中把延安說成是「閃耀在遠方的一顆星」(Yenan glowed in the distance)[42]，其態度與斯諾(Edgar Snow, 1905-1972)在《紅星照耀中國》(*Red Star Over China*)中對共產黨的嚮往並無二致。費正清在1944年從中國回到華盛頓，當時他「深信共產黨的革命已深植在中國人的生活之中，此一革命已非CC系或戴笠的警察所能壓制。而革命的理想則體現了對農民的解放與自五四以來科學與民主的傳統」(The primary conviction that I took back to Washington in 1944 was that the revolutionary movement in China was inherent in the conditions of life there and that it could not be suppressed by the provocative coercion of the CC clique and Tai Li police. The ideals of liberation for the peasantry and of science and democracy inherited from the May Fourth era twenty years before were patriotic and kinetic.)[43]。這些西方的學者不但沒有看出，這樣的政權一旦當政，有走上集權和獨裁的危險，反而還說這個革命體現了科學民主的傳統。一個有名的史學家竟犯這樣的錯誤，真是令人費解！

也正是因爲許多中外學者都在爲共產黨革命而歡呼之際，胡適能在1947年多次指出：共產黨代表的是集權獨裁，並認定1949年是中國和中

42 John King Fairbank, *Chinabound: A Fifty Year Memoir*(New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1982), p. 266.

43 *Ibid.*, p. 286.

國人失去自由，而不是獲得解放的一年，這不能不說是他的特識[44]。

1949年以後的中國知識分子不但沒有「站起來」，而且還倒下了，摧毀了，並且受到了亙古所未曾有過的侮辱和迫害。這段歷史至今是中國大陸學者所諱言的，而研究胡適的大陸學者竟無人提到胡適當年在海外曾爲這批苦難的中國知識分子有過呼號和聲援。1952年4月29日，胡適在「中國知識分子救援會」(Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc.)上作了演說，題目是〈鐵幕裏苦難的中國知識分子〉(The Suffering Chinese Intellectuals Behind the Iron Curtain)，其中對中國知識分子在共產政權之下所受到的磨難，有極爲動人的描述。演講之前，胡適首先向救援會的主席伍爾特・杰德博士(Dr. Walter Judd)及其同事爲救援逃離共產集權統治的中國知識分子致謝，接著他沉痛的指出：

> 這是一個不容否認的事實——也是一個過分低估的說法——在我們悠久的歷史上，沒有任何時代像今天的知識分子在共產中國之下受到如此道德和精神上的荼毒。
>
> 即使在長達幾世紀的統一大帝國之下，帝王有無限制的權力，也不及紅色中國每天對知識分子無所遁形而又無所不在的迫害。
>
> It is an undeniable fact, --and an understatement-that in the long history of my people, there has never been a period in which the intellectuals are subjected to so great moral and spiritual torture as they are today in Communist China.
>
> Not even in the long centuries of the unified empire under the unlimited powers of the absolute monarchy, was there such

---

44 1950年初，胡適曾勸阻當時正打算回中國的史學家王毓銓。見胡適1950年1月4日、8日日記，《胡適的日記》手稿本，冊16，無頁碼。

universal and inescapable oppression of intellectuals as is daily and everywhere practiced in the Red-controlled mainland today.

胡適在講演中接著說道，古代中國既沒有如現在龐大的軍隊，也沒有無所不在的秘密警察和密探，人們至少還有沉默的自由，而今連沉默的自由都沒有了。父子夫婦互相告發是政府所鼓勵的，在這樣嚴密統治之下，還有什麼個人自由和尊嚴之可言。他用胡思杜在報上公開批判胡適是「人民的公敵」爲例，說明「沒有沉默的自由」是如何的可怕[45]！最後他指出中共取得政權之後的兩年半之內是要把知識分子轉化成一種「自動的口號傳聲筒」(slogan-mouthing automation)[46]。

胡適所提出的「沉默的自由」是遠比「言論自由」更基本的一種人權。「沉默的自由」也就是一個人有不表態的權利，等到連這個權利都被剝奪的時候，那麼，一個人也就沒有不說假話的自由了。當時美國人對中共政權的了解是非常有限的，胡適大量的演說和文章揭露了50年代共產黨對知識分子的兇殘嘴臉。直到今天，在大陸上指出中共血腥鎮壓殘害知識分子的這段歷史，依舊只能輕描淡寫。胡適許多英文的文章爲這段悲慘的歷史作了海外的見證。

胡適在1950年9月24日的日記裡，貼了一份英文剪報報導胡思杜撰文批判胡適的事，這篇文章對胡適表示了深切的同情，並嚴厲指責共產黨這種下流而又荒誕的作法。胡適在剪報旁邊寫了幾個字：「兒子思杜留在北平，昨天忽然變成了新聞人物！此當是共產黨已得我發表長文的

---

45 胡適子胡思杜，1950年9月22日，在香港《大公報》發表〈對我父親——胡適的批判〉，文中有「他(胡適)是反動階級的忠臣，人民的敵人」的句子。這篇文章頗引起海外輿論的注意，《時代雜誌》(*Time*)曾訪問時在紐約的胡適，並以〈沒有沉默的自由〉(No Freedom of Silence)爲題在1950年10月2日刊出這篇訪問。參看1950年9月23、24、26日《胡適的日記》手稿本，第16冊。

46 講稿藏紀念館，編號爲「4-2 6美國一」，Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc. 發了新聞稿。

消息的反應」[47]。如果胡適的猜測不錯，讓共產黨如此不安的「長文」是發表在1950年10月號《外交事物》(*Foreign Affairs*)季刊上的〈史大林策略下的中國〉(China in Stalin's Grand Strategy)。這篇文章的主旨在指出共產黨在中國的成功並非如一般所說是因爲共產黨的政策深得人心，其主要原因還是紅軍在蘇聯國際共產的支助下，在抗戰八年期間武力上有了迅速而驚人的擴大，加上西安事變和雅爾達密約等種種的歷史事件造成了國民黨的失敗[48]。胡適在1950年9月6日寫給傅斯年的一封信中提到這篇文章：「主旨要人知道中國的崩潰不是像Acheson等人說的毛澤東從山洞裡出來，蔣介石的軍隊就不戰而潰了，我要人知道這是經過25年苦鬥的失敗」[49]。從歷史上來更正一部分史實，是胡適學術反共的另一手段。

胡適反共正如他當年領導新文化運動，是從思想和文化的層面著手，而不是泛泛的從政治上立論。他一方面說明共產集權爲什麼應該反，但另一方面他也從歷史和思想的角度來解釋爲什麼社會主義在近代中國能吸引如此眾多的優良知識分子。在一篇1950年代所寫，題爲〈中國爲了自由所學到的教訓〉(China's Lesson for Freedom)的講稿中，他對這個問題有所闡釋。他認爲以馬克思列寧爲標籤的共產主義之所以能在中國風靡一時，主要是基於以下三點原因：

1)至今未曾實現過的烏托邦理想的吸引；
2)對激烈革命過度的憧憬，以為革命可以改正一切的錯誤和不公正；

---

47 《胡適日記手稿本》，第16冊。

48 Hu Shih, "China in Stalin's Grand Strategy," in *Foreign Affairs*(Oct.1950), vol. 29, no.1, pp. 11-40. 有聶華苓翻的中譯本，〈史大林策略下的中國〉(台北：胡適紀念館，1967)，頁1-48。

49 〈胡適致傅斯年夫婦〉，在耿雲志、歐陽哲生編，《胡適書信集》(北京：北京大學，1996)，共3冊，冊3，頁1197。

3)最後，但絕不意味著最不重要的一點是：一些抽象的，未經清楚界定的名詞發揮了魔幻而神奇的效力。〔如「無產階級專政」，「人民民主專政」，「人民共和國」，「人民政府」等等，都屬於這一類的名詞。〕

1)the idealistic appeal of a hitherto unrealized Utopia,

2)the emotional appeal of the power of a radical revolution to right all wrongs and redress all injustices, and

3)last, but not least, the magic power of big and undefined words.

從過去幾十年和國際共產主義鬥爭的過程之中，中國所學到的教訓也有三點：

1)對未經考驗的目標和理想盲目的崇拜，並缺乏對達到這一目標和理想的過程進行必要的思考，結果不可避免的導向一種不道德的哲學，那就是目的可以使手段變得合理。

2)對社會和政治思考缺乏耐心，結果總是導向對暴力革命給以理論上和意識形態上的辯護，這種暴力革命必然導向獨裁，集權和對自由的破壞。

3)別小看一些大字眼的魔幻力量。這些大字眼到了現代獨裁者的手中，就成了他們最有力的工具。唯一的解毒丹是少許的懷疑，幾盎斯的不輕信，和少量把思想搞清楚的嚴格訓練。

1)That blind worship of an untried or unchallenged "end" or "ideal" without due consideration or the necessary means of achieving it inevitably leads to the immoral philosophy of the end justifying the means.

2)Impatience in social and political thinking invariably leads to theoretical or ideological justification of violence and violent

revolution, which tends necessarily towards dictatorship, despotism, and destruction of freedom.

3) Do not belittle the magic power of big words which are the most important stock of trade in the hands of modern tyrants and despots. The only antitoxin is a little measure of doubt, a few ounces of incredulity, and a little rigid merited discipline to make ideas clear.[50]

在這篇文章的結論中，胡適沉痛的指出：「成千上萬的人已遭到謀害，上億的人民受到奴役，而一個『人間地獄』已在我至愛的中國造成——這種種都只是爲了一個不可知的上帝——對烏托邦社會的盲目崇拜。」(So millions and tens of millions have been murdered, and hundreds of millions have been enslaved, and a "living hell" has been created in my beloved China-all in the name of an unknown god-the blindly worshipped ideal of a utopia society!)[51]

1953年4月1日，胡適在遠東學會第五屆年會上發表英文論文〈共產中國思想改造的三個階段〉(The Three Stages of the Campaign for Thought Reform in Communist China)[52]，在這篇文章中，胡適對所謂「洗腦」和「思想改造」作了最嚴厲指控，這種在「暴力和威嚇」(force and intimidation)之下所進行的「坦白」、「自我批評」和「自我批評的批評」都是對人格尊嚴和獨立思考所作最徹底的侮蔑和摧毀。胡適以馮友蘭、周培源、金岳霖、梁思成等北大和清華的著名教授爲例，說明他們當時所作的自我批評是如何的不可思議又慘不忍睹。

50 Hu Shih, "China's Lesson for Freedom." 英文打字稿，後半為手稿。藏紀念館，無編號。

51 同上。

52 原稿藏紀念館，編號為「6-17，美國一」。

1952年12月7日，胡適在北大同學歡迎會上，講到當時正在進行的胡適思想批判，他對那些辱罵他的老朋友，老學生，非但沒有半點責備，而且還寄予最深切的同情：

> 所有這些公開否認胡適思想，檢討蔡元培思想的朋友，都是在非人環境中，被壓迫而這樣做的。我們應該基於深刻的同情，知道他們沒有說話的自由，也沒有不說話的自由，我們應該體諒，他們所坦白的，絕不是他們心中要說的。

胡適同時指出「清算胡適思想，等於溫習胡適的書」，因此「這正是替我作無代價的宣傳，我很感到高興」[53]。

這種悲憫哀矜的態度也正是胡適在1950年1月9日寫〈共產黨統治下絕沒有自由〉的心情，這篇文章的副題是〈跋所謂陳垣給胡適的一封公開信〉。陳垣給胡適的公開信是1949年4月29日寫的，發表在同年5月11日的《人民日報》上，在信裡，陳垣赤裸裸的吹捧共產黨的思想改造是如何的成功，而自己在改造的過程中獲益是如何的深切，並向胡適進行統戰。胡適對陳垣不但不以氣節相責，而且還從語法用字多方面來證明這封信絕非陳垣手筆[54]。他深知在這樣暴力集權的統治之下，對任何知識分子相責以氣節，都不免是爲那個殘暴的政權在作開脫。

胡適在文末指出：陳垣「在共產黨軍隊進入北平之後三個月就得向天下人公告，他的舊治學方法雖然是『科學的』，究竟『是有著基本錯誤的』！他得向天下人公告，他已初步研究了辯證法唯物論和歷史唯物

---

53 胡適，〈北大同學會歡迎會上講話〉，在《胡適言論集》乙編(香港：自由中國出版社，1950)，頁61-62。

54 陳垣致胡適的信收入陳智超編注，《陳垣來往書信集》(上海：古籍，1990)，頁191-195。胡適的答書題為〈共產黨統治下絕沒有自由〉(跋所謂〈陳垣給胡適的一封公開信〉，原刊《自由中國》，第2卷第3期，收入胡適，《我們必須選擇我們的方向》(臺北：自由中國出版社，1950)，頁57-61。

論，確定了今後的治學方法！」還有什麼能比這個更能說明「共產黨統治之下絕沒有學術思想的自由」[55]。

結語：燎原的星火

過去20年來，中國的學術界熱中於整理研究胡適的著作和思想，每年都重版胡適舊作並出版爲數可觀的有關研究。在北京幾個重要的書店裡，還有「胡適專櫃」的設立。這不但說明胡適的思想受到學術界的重視，並且也爲廣大讀者所歡迎。換句話說，在已是21世紀的今天，胡適在中國大陸不但沒有爲人所忘記，並大有捲土重來之勢。當年人人喊打的「胡適幽靈」，「帝國主義的走狗」，「馬克思主義的死敵」而今竟成了一個「暢銷書作家」，在學術殿堂中，高踞首席。這個轉變絕不只是意味著胡適思想在中國的消長，更重要的是：胡適所一再強調的，自先秦以來即已深植人心爲自由而戰的悠久傳統，畢竟不能長久的受到壓制。

1953年1月14日，胡適對大陸文化教育界人士廣播，在廣播中曾虛白問胡適：「共產黨清算您的思想可以成功嗎？」胡適的回答是：「我相信他們清算我的思想是要大失敗的，古人說得好『野火燒不盡，春風吹又生』。共產黨是不會明白這一點點的常識的。」[56] 三四十年的烈火終究燒不盡胡適思想中那點追求自由和民主的根，21世紀的春風終將使那個久經摧殘的種籽發芽茁壯。

1998年，北京社會科學院文學所的胡明編輯出版了16卷本的《胡適精品集》，包裝的紙盒上印著「現代中國的文化宗師，『當今孔子』的巨著」。雖然這只是書商的廣告用語，但多少還是反映了胡適思想在中

---

55 同上。

56 胡適，〈同情淪陷鐵幕的知識分子——對大陸文化教育界人士廣播〉，《胡適作品集》，冊26，頁210。

國過去50年裡「九地之下」與「九天之上」的轉變。我把這16冊書和1955年出版的8冊《胡適思想批判》[57] 並排的放在書架上，我感到有些困惑也有些傷感。讓我感到傷感的倒不是胡適個人身後名的浮沈，而是這些浮沉所反映的整個中國所經歷的錯亂，迷失和瘋狂。在打倒胡適的那個血腥殘暴的歲月裡，被打倒的又何止是胡適一人，所有的中國知識分子都受到了最不堪的侮蔑和凌辱。然而，讓人感到欣慰的是胡適崇尙自由，民主與科學的思想終究沒有被暴力和集權所摧毀。近半世紀的批判和誣蔑只使得胡適思想在90年代重現時，顯得更光彩奪目。

胡適研究在當今中國成爲顯學，所顯示的另一層意義是中國在自由民主的尺度上至今還沒有趕上五四。胡適的許多「卑之無甚高論」的意見，在20世紀90年代的中國依然是「駭人聽聞」。胡適思想的精義，對當今中國人而言，不但是在「容忍」上，更是在「抗爭」上。

多年來，許多中國大陸的學者把胡適的反共歪曲成是爲了討好國民黨來打擊共產黨。這是對胡適最大的誣蔑。在胡適的思想中，「黨」之上是有「國」的，「國」是「千秋」，而「黨」只是「朝夕」。胡適的反共和他畢生爲民主自由而奮鬥的精神是完全一致的。他的反共不只是政治上的，更是文化上的，他是爲了人性的尊嚴，人格的獨立和學術的自由而反共的。

胡適從50年前「帝國主義的走狗」到如今成了「現代中國的文化宗師」，「當今孔子」，這個轉變已經遠遠超出了「政治平反」的意義，而是顯示著中國大陸的學術研究在經過近半世紀的「黨化」之後，終於露出了一點新生的曙光，雖然這點曙光是如此的微弱，但在久經沉暗的中國大陸天際，這一線光明很可能正是燎原的星火。

57 《胡適思想批判》（北京：三聯，1955），共8冊。

民國初期近代學術研究之成立

——整理國故與戴震評價

河田悌一

日本關西大學文學部教授

(一)

歐美的歷史與基督教有著切不開、斬不斷的緊密關係。同樣地，中國、朝鮮半島、日本等東亞國家的歷史離開了儒教，便無從談起。

然而，過去有一種觀念根深柢固地存在於人們的頭腦裡。此即儒教是一套腐朽沒落的思想，是導致亞洲停滯不前的負面遺產。更確切地說，儒教在中國是封建專制的中華帝國賴以存在的精神支柱，在日本則是維護天皇制的「忠君愛國」式的封建倫理道德。黑格爾早就認爲儒教才是維持中國這一「恆常帝國」[1]的封建政治意識形態。韋伯則把儒教看成是捍衛家產官僚制舊中國的「恭順倫理」，進而否定了儒教，說儒

1 關於黑格爾(G. W. F. Hegel)之中國觀，參照《歷史哲學講義》(*Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*)(長谷川宏日譯，岩波書店，上冊，1994年6月初版)。野村浩一·《近代中國の政治と思想》(筑摩書房，1964年9月初版)，4頁以下。本書富有啓發地從比較政治學的角度分析了近代中國的思想。

教「缺乏自然科學式的思維」[2]、「其發展是沒有邏輯性的」等等。

與此針鋒相對的是，在第二次世界大戰後的日本學界裡，有一批學者抱著對「儒教式中國文明之偉大」與「脊骨文化」的「虔誠的畏敬之念」，研究、考證了儒教思想發展史，認爲陽明學及其左派的思想裡早已存在著與近代西洋相同的自我覺醒，並加以廣泛宣揚。其代表性人物及論著就是島田虔次(1917-2000)教授的《中國近代思惟的挫折》[3]。這部論著與丸山真男(1914-96)教授的傑作《日本政治思想史研究》[4]堪稱爲戰後日本的思想史研究的雙璧。之所以這麼說，是因爲丸山真男探索出了德川時期儒教中「日本的近代合理主義產生」之故。

與此相比，余英時師的研究著作等身，其研究涉及到許多方面。既有初期的漢代經濟史研究，又有關於《紅樓夢》的文學史研究，更有其專長的思想史研究。但是當我潛心閱讀余英時師的著作時，發現他甚爲重視中國思想史自身所具有的「內在理路(稱之爲『道問學』與『尊德性』的交替生起)」。而且，就儒教的現代課題，余英時師在其名著《論戴震與章學誠》「自序」中闡述道：

> 我們必須承認，儒學的現代課題主要是如何建立一種客觀認知的精神，因為非如此便無法抵得住西方文化的衝擊。傳統儒學以道德為「第一義」，認知精神始終被壓抑得不能自由暢發。更不幸的是現代所謂道德已與政治力量合流，如果知識繼續以

---

2 韋伯(M. Weber)，《儒教と道教》(*Konfuzianismus und Taoismus*)(木全德雄日譯，創文社，1971年9月初版)，頁440。

3 島田虔次，《中國に於ける近代思惟の挫折》(筑摩書房，1949年3月初版、1970年12月新版)。

4 丸山眞男，《日本政治思想史研究》(岩波書店，1951年12月初版)。英譯本 *The Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan*, translated by Mikiso Hane(Princeton University Press, 1974). 該英譯本的序文(著者為英語版《日本政治思想史研究》而作的序文」)收錄在《丸山眞男集》第12卷(岩波書店，1996年8月初版)，頁75-103。

「第二義」以下的身分維持其存在，則學術將永遠成為政治的婢女，而決無獨立的價值可言[5]。

25年前，當我讀到余英時師的這本書時，不僅更加深刻地認識到了中國思想史，尤其是清代思想史中戴震與章學誠的重要性，而且為其儒教解釋與思想分析之精湛而大有猛醒之感，「一種客觀認知的精神」這一名句使我受用終生。在島田虔次師的勸導下，我為這部名著寫了書評[6]。之後，我有幸前後兩次，計兩年接受余英時師的指導，還參加了其研究班。今天，在余英時師榮退紀念大會上，我就以「一種客觀認知的精神」這一句話為關鍵詞，重點考察戴震，並以「整理國故」運動中出現的戴震評價為線索來考證從清末到民初的思想狀況，尤其是近代學術之成立這一問題。這就是我的報告主題。

(二)

中國最後的封建王朝清朝，在1840年的鴉片戰爭所象徵的「西方的衝擊」(Western Impact)下，搖搖欲墜。自漢武帝以來持續了兩千多年的以儒教為國教的體制，在由18世紀60年代的產業革命而快速發展起來的英國的武力之下顯得不堪一擊。中國就這樣揭開了近代的序幕。

何謂近代呢？近代化(Modernization)又為何物？我首先列舉出六個測定近代化的指標。此即(1)政治上的民主化；(2)經濟上的資本主義(包括舊蘇聯等國的國家資本主義)；(3)產業上的工廠制生產；(4)科學

5 余英時，《論戴震與章學誠——清代中期學術思想史研究》(香港：龍門書店，1976年9月初版)，〈自序〉，頁7。

6 河田悌一，〈書評：余英時《論戴震與章學誠》〉，《史林》第60卷第5號(1977年9月)。該書評的漢語譯文見〈評余英時著《論戴震與章學誠》〉(高明士節譯)，《史學評論》第1期(1979年7月)，頁257-260。

技術上的進步；(5)教育上的國民義務教育；(6)意識形態上從共同體的束縛中解放出來以及個人主義達到成熟的水平[7]。

當然，對這六大指標，完全可以從不同的角度加以反駁。但是，當我們考察一下21世紀初的當今，看一看分布在歐美、亞洲、伊斯蘭教世界、拉丁美洲等業已近代化了的各個國家，誰也不得不承認這六大要素仍然在改革舊體制、完成近代化建設中發揮著重要作用。中國亦不例外。始於鴉片戰爭這一「西方文化衝擊」的中國的近代及其近代化正是一個努力把封建專制君主統治的舊體制一步一步地變革成爲具有這6大要素的現代社會的歷史過程。（不言而喻，在當代中國大陸，具有良知的知識分子、學生以及民眾不斷地追求著民主化。中國還遠沒有完成近代化的大業。）

那麼，在這一歷史過程當中，具有儒教批判精神、並具備余英時師所說的「一種客觀認知的精神」的、所謂近代學術研究從什麼時候開始的呢？本人認爲可以把時期鎖定在1910年代末期到20年代初期。更爲確切的說，其標識就是1919年2月出版的胡適《中國哲學史大綱(上)》[8]以及1921年2月出版的梁啓超《清代學術概論》[9]。換言之，中國學術研究的近代化是以「有必要掀起一場對舊中國的文化歷史進行科學整理的學術運動」這一「整理國故」運動的形式出現的。

---

7 以上觀點主要借自桑原武夫〈傳統と近代化〉，岩波講座《現代思想》第11卷（岩波書店，1957年11月初版，現收錄於《桑原武夫集》第5卷[岩波書店、1980年8月初版]，頁115)。

8 胡適《中國哲學史大綱(上)》(上海商務印書館、1919年2月初版)。該書附上蔡元培的〈序文〉，作為北京大學叢書之一出版。1929年收入「萬有文庫」時，改稱為《中國古代哲學史》。

9 根據小野和子日譯本《清代學術概論》(平凡社，1974年1月初版)「解說」，梁啓超把從1920年11月到21年1月分三次發表在《改造》第3卷第3-5號(北京新學會發行)的論文〈前清一代中國思想界之蛻變〉作為共學社史學叢書的1冊，即《清代學術概論》(上海商務印書館、1921年2月初版)來出版的。

（三）

那麼，「整理國故」到底是怎麼一回事呢？一般地說，「整理國故」就是清末以來在探討傳統文化、傳統思想的過程中，重新發現、重新評估其價值的學術運動。追尋其起源的話，或許可以上溯至譚嗣同運用王夫之(船山)的道器論(器先道後論)、梁啓超把黃宗羲奉爲「中國的盧梭」(民主主義的首唱者)加以評價、宣傳爲止[10]。但是，就常識而言，恐怕把1905年2月23日在上海創刊的《國粹學報》的發刊辭作爲發端更爲妥當。發刊辭拒絕了對「泰西學術」的盲目崇拜，宣稱道：

> 海通以來，泰西學術輸入中邦，震旦文明不絕一線。無識陋儒或揚西抑中，視舊籍如苴土。……夫前賢學派，各有師承。懿行嘉言，在在可法。至若陽明授徒獨稱心得，習齋講學趨重實行，東原治經力崇新理，椎輪篳路，用能別闢途徑，啓發後人承學之士。正可師三賢之意，綜百家之長，以觀學術之會通[11]。

這份《國粹學報》自創刊到辛亥革命成功後停刊爲止，共出版了82冊。其間，介紹、彰顯了王陽明、顏元、戴震、清代三大家以及李塨、明代的李卓吾、金聖嘆、呂晚村、乾嘉期的章學誠與汪中等等富有個性和獨創性的思想家，以喚起人們的注意。誇張一點兒地說，章學誠是被

---

10 關於梁啓超把黃宗羲奉為「中國的盧梭」加以讚美，參照島田虔次，〈中國のルソー〉，《中國革命の先驅者》(筑摩書房、1965年10月初版)，頁123以下。

11 〈國粹學報發刊辭〉，《國粹學報》第1號(光緒31[1905]年1月20日，文海出版社影印本)，頁7。

他們從歷史的深淵裡挖掘出來的。這些成績當歸功於劉師培。有人說劉師培「7年間累計82期，每期刊登數篇研究論文，從不間斷」[12]。當時，劉師培改名爲劉光漢，積極主張反滿革命。然而，有趣的是，他卻是出生於向來以揚州學派傳統爲自豪的清朝考證學派書香門第的神童。眾所周知，揚州學派發軔於王懋竑，經汪中、王念孫、王引之承繼，延至焦循、阮元。由此看來，「整理國故」的起源可以追溯到清朝考證學派。

當然，不可能把一切都歸功於劉師培一個人。眾所周知，顧頡剛曾在大他兩歲的胡適那裡做過旁聽生。他在著名的《古史辨・自序》中闡述道：

> 清代學者則敢於脫離應用的束縛；以前總好規定崇奉的一尊，而清代學者為要回復古代的各種家派，無意中把一尊的束縛也解除了。清末的古文家依然照了舊日的途徑而進行；今文家便因時勢的激盪而獨標新義，提出了孔子託古改制的問題做自己的託古改制的護符。這兩派衝突時，個個盡力揭破對方的弱點，使得觀戰的人消歇了從家派的迷夢。同時，西洋的科學傳了進來，中國學者受到它的影響，對於治學的方法有了根本的覺悟，要把中國古今的學術整理清楚，認識它們的歷史的價值。整理國故的呼聲倡始於太炎先生，而上軌道的進行則發軔於適之先生的具體的計畫[13]。

正如「整理國故的呼聲倡始於太炎先生」所示，顧頡剛把「整理國

12 小島祐馬，〈劉師培の學〉，《中國の社會思想》（筑摩書房，1967年11月初版），頁348。關於劉師培的戴震評價，參照河田悌一，〈清末の戴震像——劉師培の場合〉，《森三樹三郎博士頌壽紀念　東洋學論集》（朋友書店，1979年12月初版）。

13 顧頡剛，〈古史辨自序〉，《古史辨》第1冊（1926年初版，明倫出版社影印本），頁77-78。

故」的開始、起源歸結於章太炎。這是因爲章炳麟曾取王充《論衡》之名而著有《國故論衡》之緣故。顧頡剛又說「而上軌道的進行則發軔於適之先生的具體的計畫」。好了，胡適自己又如何看待「整理國故」的呢？胡適1922年3月3日在刊登在《申報五十周年紀念冊》的〈五十年來中國之文學〉中，這樣評價了章炳麟的學問：

> 章炳麟是清代學術史的押陣大將，但他又是一個文學家。他的國故論衡、檢論，都是古文學的上等作品。這五十年中著書的人沒有一個像他那樣精心結構的，不但這五十年，其實我們可以說這兩千年中只有七八部精心結構，可以稱做「著作」的書，如文心雕龍、史通、文史通義等。其餘的只是結集，只是語錄，只是稿本，但不是著作。章炳麟的國故論衡要算是這七八部之中的一部了，他的古文學工夫很深，他又是很富於思想與組織力的，故他的著作在內容與形式兩方面都能「成一家言」[14]。

顯而易見，胡適比顧頡剛早3年就明確地承認了章炳麟的《國故論衡》的價值。而且稍後，胡適在東南大學國學研究會上做了題爲〈再談談整理國故〉的演講。其中，他闡述道：「國故二字爲章太炎先生創出來的，比國粹、國華、……等名詞要好得多，因爲他沒有含得有褒貶的意義。」[15] 由此可見，胡適早已承認「國故二字」爲章炳麟的創造。非但如此，早在留美時期寫下的《胡適留學日記》已多處提及章炳麟的學問功績，表現了他對章炳麟的深切崇敬。這一事實，余英時師已在《中

---

14 胡適，〈五十年來中國文學〉，《胡適文存》第2集第1卷(亞東圖書館，1924年9月初版，遠東圖書公司影印本)，頁216。

15 胡適，〈再談談整理國故　—胡適之先生在東大演講〉(葉維筆記)，《晨報副鐫》1924年2月25日第一面。此外許嘯天編，《國故學討論集》第1集所收(上海書店，1991年12月初版[群學社1927年版影印])，頁22中，還提到：「國故這兩字，是章太炎先生提出，比從前用『國粹』好多了。」

國近代思想史上的胡適》[16] 指出過。而且王汎森教授在《章太炎的思想》[17]一書中認爲胡適不僅視「章氏的《新方言》及《檢論》是他此時最常用參考書之一」，還在《中國哲學史大綱》〈自序〉中談到：「對於近人，我最感謝章太炎先生。」

確實胡適對章炳麟充滿了敬意，把「整理國故」的開始、起源歸結於章炳麟的《國故論衡》。與此相反，章炳麟則只是把胡適當成留洋的「淺學的」才子。

在胡適晚年擔任其秘書的胡頌平先生花費了五年時間寫下了《胡適之先生年譜長篇初稿》。該書披露了一些饒有興趣的事實。

1923年秋，章士釗在上海《新聞報》上發表了一篇〈墨學談〉，評論胡適。

> 適之獨謂彼為誤字，以《廣韻》引《論語》子西佊哉為例，佊誤作彼，而佊與駁通，爭佊猶言爭駁。……豈非陷全經於無意義[18]？

章炳麟讀罷此文，於11月6日給章士釗寫了一封信。信中說：「至適之以爭彼爲佊，徒成辭費，此未知說諸子之法與說經有異。」[19]

而讀了這封信的胡適於11月13日，即一星期後，給章士釗寄去了一份書簡。他一方面承認自己是「淺學的人」，另一方面又加以辯解：

> 太炎先生說我「未知說諸子之法與說經有異」。我是淺學的人，實在不知說諸子之法與說經有何異點。我只曉得經與子同

16 余英時，《中國近代思想史上的胡適》（聯經出版，1984年5月初版），頁23。

17 王汎森，《章太炎的思想(1868-1919)及其對儒學傳統的衝擊》（時報文化出版，1985年5月初版），頁213、229。

18 胡頌平編著，《胡適之先生年譜長編初稿》第2冊（聯經出版，1984年初版），頁549。

19 同上書，頁549。

為古書，治之之法只有一途，即是用校勘學與訓詁學的方法，以求本子的訂正與古義的考定。……[20]

或許在舊學大家章炳麟和章士釗的眼裡，胡適是一個不屑一顧的留洋歸來的「淺學的人」。然而，對渴求新知識新學問、充滿好奇心的青年學生來說，胡適的講座以及一本接一本的新書出版是多帶刺激、多麼重要呀！當時，被公認爲保守思想代表人物的梁漱溟在北京大學文科擔任「儒家思想」講座。他回憶說：「來聽講的通常總有在200人左右」，所以「初排定在紅樓第一院某教室，卻改在第二院大講堂才行」。與此相比。「胡適之講課，其聽講的人可能比這還要多。」[21] 梁漱溟不僅稱讚胡適「爲人和易平正，」還高度評價道：

當時發生最大作用的人，第一要數陳獨秀先生，次則胡適之先生，且不論他們兩位學問深淺如何，但都有一種本領，就是能以自己把握得的一點意思度與眾人。胡先生頭腦明爽，凡所發揮，人人易曉。當時的新文化運動自不能不歸功於他[22]。

更有甚者，87歲高齡的顧頡剛於1980年(同年去世)懷著無比感慨的心情，在大陸學術刊物《中國哲學》第二輯撰文追憶恩師胡適：

當我在北大「中國哲學系」裡上二年級時，我恰和傅斯年同住在「西齋」的一間宿舍裡，彼此高談闊論，大有「塤篪相應」的樂趣。那時又值蔡元培校長請陳獨秀任「文科學長」(等於

20 同上書，頁550。
21 梁漱溟，〈五四運動前後的北京大學〉，《憶往談舊錄》(中國文史出版社，1987年12月初版)，頁84。
22 梁漱溟，〈紀念蔡元培先生——為蔡先生逝世2周年〉，《憶往談舊錄》，頁89。

現在各大學的「文學院院長」)，又把在《新青年》上主張用白話作文的胡適從美國請回來，開「中國哲學史」和「西洋哲學史」兩門功課。「西洋哲學史」，他無須預備，因為早有西洋哲學家編成的書可作他講課的藍本。獨有「中國哲學史」一課，兩千多年來只堆積了一大批資料，還連貫不起一個系統來。他又年輕，那時才二十七歲，許多同學都瞧不起他。我瞧他略去了從遠古到夏、商的可疑而又不勝其煩的一段，只從《詩經》裡取材，稱西周後期為「詩人時代」，有截斷眾流的魄力，就對傅斯年說了。傅斯年本是「中國文學系」的學生，黃侃教授的高足，而黃侃則是北大裡有力的守舊派，一向為了《新青年》派提倡白話文而引起他的痛罵的，料想不到我竟把傅斯年引進了胡適的路子上去，後來竟辦起《新潮》來，成為《新青年》的得力助手[23]。

由此可知，在民國初期、即從1910年代到20年代初期學術界裡，「整理國故」運動雖然始於章炳麟(或者劉師培)，但真正發揮推進作用的則是胡適。

(四)

可是，「整理國故」的國故二字到底是什麼意思呢？國故的詞源出現在《禮記》文王世子篇。曰：「凡釋奠者，必有合也。有國故則否。」根據元代的陳澔所註：「若國有凶喪之故。」[24] 即國家有災難、

23 顧頡剛，〈我是怎樣編寫『古史辨』的？(上)〉，《中國哲學》第2輯(生活・讀書・新知三聯書店，1980年3月初版)，頁332。

24 陳澔，《禮記集說》：「凡行釋奠之禮，必有合樂之事。若國有凶喪之故，則雖釋奠，不合樂也。」

危機、喪失、重大事件等語義。到了清末，章炳麟把國故與國詁作爲同義語，也就是說使「國故」帶有本國的文字、傳統文化、傳統思想、傳統學術的意思，並第一次使用在其著《國故論衡》。

有趣的是，清末就已出現了「國學」這一新的語詞。國學出自於《周禮》春官篇[25]。可是，在清末，經過亡命或者留學日本的學者、改良主義者、革命家、學生的改造，「國學」這一語詞也帶有傳統學術的含意而被開始使用。比如說，1905年11月，中國(革命)同盟會在東京創辦了機關雜誌《民報》。在這一背景下，留學生們組織了「國學講習會」，邀請章炳麟講授「國學」。當時，章炳麟每星期天上午都要在小石川新小川町的居家(民報社)裡教授《說文解字》。前來聽課的有周樹人(魯迅)、周作人，許壽裳、錢玄同、朱希祖等等[26]。不過，這裡的「國學」二字，恐怕受到日本江戶時期學者的影響。比如說，荷田春滿(Kada no Azumamaro,1669-1736)、賀茂真淵(Kamo no Mabuchi, 1697-1769)、本居宣長(Motoori Norinaga, 1730-1801)等人都把與中國學問相異的，包括傳統的學術、文化、思想、文學、詩歌、神道等日本獨自的古典通稱爲「國學」。我個人認爲20世紀初，面對著洶湧澎湃的歐化浪潮，中國留學生有意無意地將中國特有的傳統的學術、文化、思想、文學稱之爲「國學」[27]。換言之，

---

25 《周禮》春官宗伯篇：「樂師掌國學之政，以教國子小舞。」

26 參照島田虔次，〈章炳麟について〉，《中國革命の先驅者》(筑摩書房，1965年10月初版)，頁189-190。

27 關於「國學」這一概念的成立，參照野村八良，《國學全史》上卷第五章〈國學の創始者——荷田春滿〉(關書院，1928年11月初版)。春滿1728年(享保13年)，即六十歲時，上奏江戶幕府(第八代將軍德川吉宗)：「謹請蒙鴻慈創造國學校啓」(同書，頁511-512)。即希望創辦傳授「國學」(倭學、和學)等日本的傳統學術，而非儒教主義式的學校。此外，關於國學，參照松本三之介，《國學政治思想の研究》(有斐閣、1957年5月初版)；大久保正，《江戶時代の國學》(至文堂、1963年7月初版)；重松信弘，《近世國學の文學研究》(風間書房、1974年2月初版)；芳賀登、松本三之介校注，《國學運動の思想》(岩波講座日本思想大系第51卷，岩波書店，1971年3月初版)等。

「國學」是清末民初從日本進口的術語之一[28]。

前面提到的《國粹學報》正是鄧實、劉光漢(師培)、馬敘倫等民族主義思想家憤慨於「無識陋儒或揚西抑中，視舊籍如苴土」而組織的「國學保存會」的機關雜誌。

由此可見，「整理國故」這一重新評價中國傳統學術的新潮緣起於「西方的衝擊」之下欲以奮起捍衛中國的文化、歷史這一極其樸素的心理和感情。然而，這種心理和感情難免帶有使人具有保守、頑固、狹隘的民族主義的傾向。這種傾向在自幼飽學傳統學術的劉師培身上表現得再也清楚不過了。

本人認為「整理國故」有四個流派。

第一，保守派出於對五四新文化運動的心理上的反感、思想上的反動而組成的保衛、擁護傳統文化的一派。

第二，以胡適為代表的，力圖「用自覺的科學方法」對傳統文化，尤其是傳統思想進行冷靜的重新探討、重新評價的思想史研究派。

第三，胡適本人及其受之影響，對元、明、清各代文學作品加以整理、考證的流派，還包括周作人等人對民間歌謠、故事傳說進行收集、研究的文學史研究派。

第四，顧頡剛、錢玄同[29]等疑古派為打破舊有的傳統歷史學、歷史觀，利用民俗學，挖掘資料而興起的歷史研究派。

本文著重於第一和第二這兩個流派。首先，第一個流派，即以保護

---

28 關於清末以來中國進口日製漢語，參考關西大學沈國威教授，《近代日中國語彙交流史——新漢語の生成と受容》(笠間書院、1994年3月初版)。沈教授認為19世紀末以降從日本傳到中國，並被使用漢語生活用語達1500種以上；學術用語(從人文、社會科學用語到地質學、遺傳學、醫學、解剖學用語等自然科學專業術語)高達數千語以上。

29 比如說，關於顧頡剛，參考王汎森，《古史辨運動的興起》(允晨文化實業、1987年4月初版)；關於錢玄同，參考周質平，〈胡適與錢玄同〉，《胡適與魯迅》(時報文化出版、1988年6月初版)，頁49-76。

和彰顯傳統文化爲目的的，由所謂保守派、守舊派展開的「整理國故」運動。這個流派的象徵就是月刊雜誌《國故》。1919年1月26日，爲「慨然於國學淪夷，欲發起學報，以圖挽救，」[30] 俞士鎮、張煊等數十名學生和六名教員在劉師培家集合，召開了成立大會。同年3月23日，正式宣告月刊機關雜誌《國故》誕生，明確規定「本刊以昌明中國固有之學術爲宗旨」，陳漢章、馬敘倫等八人擔任特別編輯，張煊等十人主持編輯[31]。與劉師培一起肩負「總編」重任的黃侃在第一期卷首「國故月刊題辭」中，呼喚「有志之士，誠能振頹綱紹前載，鼓芳風以扇遊塵。」但是，隨著時代的潮流的變化，這份雜誌到9月20日爲止的半年中只出版了四期。張煊在第一期發表了反對白話的〈言文一致平議〉，在第三期登載了〈駁新潮「國故和科學的精神」篇〉。他把胡適、毛子水等人的思想觀點看成是「醉西說蔑視國故者之謬解」，把他們罵得狗血噴頭。他們純粹是因爲厭惡《新潮》派而刻意對抗的[32]。

1920年5月，這一保守派人物稟承大總統徐世昌旨意，宣稱「以闡明顏李學說習行一貫爲宗旨」[33]，在北京西城府右街舊太僕寺署成立了四存學會。該四存學會基於「東方大陸既輸入歐美文明矣。獨周公孔子之正傳，士大夫鉗口結舌噤無一言莫能盡力表章揭諸日月先聖之憾，不亦吾黨之羞乎」[34] 這樣一種認識，不僅發行了機關雜誌《四存月刊》，還以「本(顏元、李塨)兩先生質樸耐勞習行一貫之旨，悉本實用主義以養成道德完備知識充足身體強健能自樹立之國民」[35] 爲「教授精神」，

---

30 〈本社記事錄：發起始末〉，《國故》月刊第1期(1919年3月20日發行)。

31 〈本社記事錄：成立大會及章程〉，《國故》月刊第1期。

32 張煊，〈駁新潮「國故和科學的精神」篇〉，《國故》月刊第3期(1919年7月20日發行？)。

33 〈四存學會簡章〉，《四存月刊》第1期(1921年4月發行)。

34 李見荃，〈四存月刊創刊詞〉，《四存月刊》第1期(1921年4月發行)。

35 〈四存中學校各科教授要旨〉，《四存月刊》第2期(1921年5月發行)。1921年1月7日，四存中學正式成立，賀樹楷為校長，3個班共138名學生。校訓是「尚實學、尚實習、尚實行」，開設了「治十三經及中外歷史」的經史課、文事

創辦了四存中學，展開了實際的教育活動。

由此可見，舊派的「整理國故」是以儒教爲主的中國古典、乃至國粹主義爲信條，力圖從中國的傳統文化中尋求自我存在以及自我認同的依據的一種運動。當然，保守派、守舊派、頑固派之間，在思想上還是有一定的溫差的。作爲頑固的保守主義集團的四存學會暫且不論，創辦《國故》的劉師培到了晚年，與《國粹學報》時期相比，在思想上具有強烈地回歸傳統文化的傾向[36]。而章炳麟則在某些程度上承認了歐化，表現出容忍西洋的度量。兩者相比，劉氏遠比章氏強烈地抗拒西洋思想及其學術，思想更爲保守得多。

與此不同的是以胡適爲核心的、揭開中國近代學術序幕並宣告中國近代學術成立的「整理國故」運動。作爲新派的胡適，其眼光嶄新而又冷靜，總是與舊中國的傳統文化保持一定的距離，力圖客觀地重建之。1919年8月16日，在答毛子水的文章(後命名爲〈論國故學〉、《新潮》第2卷第1號)中，胡適明確地批評了《國故》派的張煊，說：「張君的大病是不解《國故學》的性質。」同時，他還闡述道：

> 我以為我們做學問不當先存這個狹義的功利觀念。做學問的人當看自己性之所近，揀選所要做的學問，揀定之後，當存一個「為真理而求真理」的態度。研究學術史的人更當用「為真理而求真理」的標準去批評各家的學術。學問是平等的。……現在整理國故的必要，實在很多。我們應該盡力指導「國故家」用科學的研究法去做國故的研究，不當存一個「有用無用」的

(續)

課、武備課、藝能課等四門課程。

36 關於劉師培的為人，顧頡剛曾指出：「劉師培，他是『洪憲六君子』之一，捧袁世凱作皇帝的，來教中文系的『中古文學史』，這個肺病到了第三期的人，居然在北大度過了他最後的三、四年。這個人的品格雖卑鄙，樣子還不算特別。只有英文系的辜鴻銘教授才特別。」(〈我所知道的蔡元培先生〉，《中國哲學》第4輯，1980年10月初版)，頁448。

成見，致生出許多無謂的意見。……我們若能用自覺的科學方法，加上許多防弊的法子，用來研究國故，將來的成績一定更大了[37]。

換言之，胡適宣稱要依靠「自覺的科學方法」排除迷信和政治的需求，必須「用『爲真理而求真理』的標準去批評各家的學術」，並付諸實踐。從胡適的主張，我們不是可以發現余英時師所說的「現代課題」，即「一種客觀認知的精神」這一近代學術研究的成立條件了嗎？我個人認爲這是值得大書特書的胡適的偉大功勞，應該對此作高度評價。

胡適於1923年1月創辦了《國學季刊》。在〈國學季刊發刊宣言〉中，他評價了清朝以來近300年的學問，同時還指出了三大缺陷。其一、「研究的範圍太狹窄」，偏頗儒家經典。其二、「太注重功力而忽略了理解。」而沒有真正的思想家、歷史家。其三、「參考比較的材料。」他個人認爲近代學術研究的方法論歸納起來有如下三條。

第一、用歷史的眼光來擴大國學研究的範圍。
第二、用系統的整理來部勒國學的研究材料。
(甲)索引式的整理。(乙)結帳式的整理。(丙)專史式的整理。
第三、用比較的研究來幫助國學的材料的整理與解釋。

---

37 胡適，〈答毛子水〉，《新潮》第2卷第1號(1919年8月16日發行)。胡適的這篇文章附錄在毛子水反駁張煊，〈駁新潮「國故和科學的精神」篇〉，《國故》月刊第3期(注31)的文章〈駁新潮「國故和科學的精神」篇訂誤〉(《新潮》第2卷第1號)的末尾。之後，胡適又以〈論國故——答毛子水〉為題收錄到《胡適文存》第1集。還有注15引用的許嘯天編《國故學討論集》第1集(上海書店、1991年12月初版[群學社1927年版影印]，頁131-134)也收錄了這篇文章。

胡適還主張迄今爲止研究「（中國）一切過去的歷史文化的學問」時所使用的「國故學」要加以「縮寫」「省稱」，今後就稱作「國學」。他說：

> 「國學」在我們的心眼裡，只是「國故學」的縮寫。中國的一切過去的文化歷史，都是我們的「國故」；研究這一切過去的歷史文化的學問，就是「國故學」，省稱為「國學」。「國故」這個名詞，最為妥當；因為他是一個中立的名詞，不含褒貶的意義。「國故」包含「國粹」；但他又包含「國渣」。我們若不了解「國渣」，如何懂得「國粹」？所以我們現在要擴充國學的領域，包括上下三四千年的過去文化，打破一切的門戶成見；拿歷史的眼光來整統一切，認清了「國故學」的使命是整理中國一切文化歷史，便可以把一切狹陋門户之見都掃空了[38]。

（五）

我們已經知道作爲近代學術研究運動的「整理國故」，是運用胡適提出的三個方法論來打破「一切狹陋的門戶之見」的。那麼，這個運動是如何展開的呢？以下，我將以重新評價戴震(1724-77)爲例，進行個案分析，就〈「整理國故」過程中傳統思想是被如何解釋的？〉這一問題做一些介紹。

爲什麼不提別人，而非要講戴震呢？這是因爲1923年秋戴震倍受北京學術界關注的緣故。當時，1924年1月19日正值戴震誕辰兩百周年。

38 〈國學季刊發刊宣言〉，《國學季刊》第1卷第1期(1923年1月發行)。《胡適文存》第2集所收。

而戴震與胡適同是安徽人。作爲同鄉的胡適高度評價戴震是成就「建設新哲學」之大事業[39]的「偉大的思想家」。他與梁啓超舉辦了盛大的學術活動以紀念戴震。許多學者都參加了紀念活動，戴震研究得到了很大的發展。重新評價戴震的活動盛況從北京出版的《晨報副鐫》可見一斑。發端是在1923年10月5日《晨報副鐫》論壇專欄上登出的廣告。其文如下。

> 今年陰曆十二月二十六日(即一九二四年二月十四日)為戴東原誕生二百年紀念。國內學術團體，如講學社、北大國學門研究所等，擬共同發起，有所舉動。本刊原擬屆時特出專號，但一則因篇幅有限，恐容不下多少文章。二則因戴先生學問太近專門，又恐不能邀大多數人的注意。故願先登汪君撰兩篇(另一篇為戴氏之心理學)，藉資提倡，海內國學家或能因此紀念引起研究戴氏學說的興趣罷[40]。

緊接在廣告文的後面的是汪震的論文〈戴震的哲學〉。到第二年底，即一年又兩個月裡，《晨報副鐫》不遺餘力地就戴震的學問、思想、著述、人生人物從各個角度進行分析，力圖重塑一個新的戴震形象。其間，刊登的與戴震有關的文章與報導竟達如下之多。

(1)汪震〈戴震的哲學〉(23年10月5日-8日)

(2)汪震〈戴震的心理學〉(23年10月10日-13日)

(3)賀麟〈戴東原研究指南〉(23年12月8日-10日、12日)

(4)甘蟄仙〈戴東原的名學史觀〉(24年1月7日-18日、22日-25日、

39 胡適，〈戴東原的哲學〉，《國學季刊》第2卷第1期(1925年12月發行)，頁13(現台灣商務印書館人人文庫版《戴東原的哲學》，頁21)。

40 《晨報副鐫》1923年第242號，中華民國12年10月5日發行〈論壇欄〉(人民出版社，1981年影印本第5冊)。

27日、28日)

(5)《東原二百年紀念號》(24年1月19日、20日、22日-25日)

(6)梁啓超〈戴東原先生傳〉(24年1月19日)

(7)梁啓超〈東原著述纂校書目考〉(24年1月19日、20日)

(8)陳展雲〈戴東原的天算學〉(24年1月22日-23日)

(9)梁啓超〈東原哲學〉(24年1月24日、25日)

(10)梁啓超〈東原圖書館緣起〉(24年1月25日)

(11)〈東原圖書館募捐辦法〉(24年1月25日)

(12)王競〈東原著述考〉(24年2月12日-15日)

(13)《戴東原二百年生日紀念論文集》(24年4月?)

(14)甘蟄仙〈戴東原的名學史觀〉(24年3月9日、10日、12日-20日、26日-31日、4月19日、20日、23日、26日、27日、30日、5月2日、3日、5日、7日、9日、10日、26日-29日、6月15日-17日、19日、20日、8月16日-20日、22日-31日)

(15)甘蟄仙〈康德紀念與東原紀念〉(24年4月22日)

(16)楊世清〈戴東原的求理方法〉(24年12月16日、17日)

上述文章的解說因「篇幅有限」無以展開。在此扼要地介紹一下其主要內容。

(1)汪震〈戴震的哲學〉

戴震的哲學價值在1921年出版的梁啓超著《清代學術概論》中已第一次得到承認,但是梁「也沒有承認他的哲學是成功的」。而汪震通過精讀《孟子字義疏證》,進而認爲:「不但在宋明一系的哲學上占重要位置,而且也是中國有史以來的哲學上獨創一幟的。」其「哲學的特點是有很重的數學色彩」,「有西洋哲學家的儼重精神」。還指出「反對禁慾主義」與「提倡科學的態度」是戴震在哲學上的兩大主張;而心理學和從儒家哲學裡得來的思想則是其哲學的「兩種來源」。尤其重要的

是，汪指出戴震認爲「天理是理智的」、「天理乃是一種客觀的人情標準」。這個指出極其重要。

(2)汪震〈戴震的心理學〉

汪氏認爲戴氏的心理學有兩個特徵。即一方面「心理學有許多有價值的地方」，而另一方面卻「脫離玄學獨立，與機能心理學者有一致之點。」比如說，「性相近也」的「性」，「戴震以爲人的個性是人人不同，因之人的生活也是個個人不同的。」「性即是機能的全體，遺傳的結果。」在論述，「性者血氣心知」時，認爲：「血氣便是生理的觀念，知便是心理的觀念。」其「性的作用」包含了「欲(本能意志)、情(感情)、知(理智)」等三個要素。戴氏主張「欲根於知氣」，「欲是生理的需要」等。換言之，戴震「根據他的心理學把理欲都認爲性的機能」，進而否定了宋儒的「理欲二元論，理是善的，欲是惡的」的觀點，創造出了肯定欲望的「新人生哲學」。

(3)賀麟〈戴東原研究指南〉

賀麟〈戴東原研究指南〉是爲了「要大爲增高」「國人對於戴東原學說的興趣」和爲了「就是想讀者知道戴東原自己的著作和後人關於他的著作的大概以爲檢察參考和著手研究的方便」，在梁啓超的指導和校對下發表的。「研究指南目錄」共分爲以下5大類。

（一）戴東原自著的書
（二）戴東原所校的書
（三）戴東原所參與編輯的書
（四）戴東原未著成的書
（五）後人關於戴東原的著作
　　A)史傳之屬

B)論文之屬

C)反對戴氏之屬

不同類別附上了相應的按語，還介紹了相關的書籍。這個研究指南即便在今天依然有著研究史學的意義和作用。比如，在(B)群中裡列舉了焦循〈申戴〉、梁啓超《清代學術概論》、章炳麟〈清儒〉〈學隱〉、胡適〈清代學者的治學方法〉、梁啓超〈戴東原二百年之生日〉《時事新報》民國12年國慶紀念增刊、汪震〈戴震的哲學〉〈戴震的心理學〉等文獻。

(4)甘蟄仙〈戴東原的名學史觀〉

〈戴東原的名學史觀〉(上篇)是一篇大部頭論文。由一、導言，二、戴東原與墨家的名學，三、戴東原與道家的名學，四、戴東原與儒家的名學一(孔子)，五、戴東原與儒家的名學二(孟子)，六、戴東原與儒家的名學三(荀子上)，七、戴東原與儒家的名學四(荀子下)，八、戴東原與法家的名學，九、小結等九個部分組成。從24年1月7日開始連載到同月28日。這裡摘取數行，以饗諸位。甘氏寫道：

> 戴東原是清代的一位大考證學家，也是近代中國的大思想家大哲學家。他治學的規模很壯大，所下的工夫很踏實，其思想發展的方向又很多。就哲學思想言之，已覺可做多方面的詳細觀察；若就入門下手著眼，嘗試說幾句較簡約的話，則東原之學，亦歸於愛智而已。再分析言之，愛是直覺的，是情感方面的作用；智是推知的，是理智的作用。理智也好，直覺也好，其最初的出發點，總不外乎吾心。吾人的本心，是否可以與宇宙的本體融會為一？這是人生觀與宇宙論上最大的待決問題。但據戴氏的意思推來，……

(5)《東原二百年紀念號》[41](24年1月19日、20日、22日～25日)

剛才引用的1923年10月的「廣告文」裡寫道：「今年陰曆十二月二十六日(即一九二四年二月十四日)爲戴東原誕生二百年紀念。可是《東原二百年紀念號》卻說戴震的生日「本在陰曆(雍正元年)十二月二十四日」。實際上這裡涉及到陰陽曆的換算問題。「換算陽曆在我們普通人是不很容易，幸有中央觀象台高曙青台長擔任這事。」把戴震的生日定在「陽曆一月十九日」。這一天，在北京的安徽會館召開了盛大的誕生兩百年紀念大會。該會「依照歐洲紀念年會的辦法」，「純以講學爲紀念主體，對於遺像可以自由瞻仰，但沒有形式的儀節。」當天，「胡適之先生一個極新穎的題目『不講理的戴東原』」「因時間匆促不能錄出原稿，將來當可刊登他的講演記錄。」然而，遺憾的是，胡適的演講並沒有在《晨報副鐫》上刊登出來。不過，一個月前，胡適在〈戴東原在中國哲學史上的位置〉裡，把戴震放在與大思想家朱子、王陽明同等的位置上加以評價。他說：「這八百年來，中國思想史上出了三個極重要的人物，每人畫出了一個新紀元。一個是朱子(1130-1200)、一個是王陽明(1470-1528)、一個是戴東原。」[42] 末了，胡適做了概括總結：

> 人都知道戴東原是清代經學大師，音韻的大師，清代考覈之學的第一大師。但很少人知道他是朱子以後第一個大思想家、大

---

41 〈東原二百年紀念號〉，《晨報副鐫》1924年第13號，中華民國13年1月19日發行。由〈緣起〉、梁啓超〈戴東原先生傳〉、〈東原著述纂校書目考〉等組成，共八個版面。

42 胡適，〈戴東原在中國哲學史上的位置〉，《讀書雜誌》第17期(1924年1月6日發行)。現收錄在許嘯天編，《國故學討論集》第4集(上海書店，1991年12月初版[群學社1927年版影印])，頁271。

> 哲學家。他在經學考據的方面，雖有開山之功，但他的弟子王念孫、段玉裁等人的成績，早已超過他了。他在哲學的方面，二百年來，只有一個焦循了解得一部分；但論思想的透闢，氣魄的偉大，二百年來，戴東原眞成獨霸了[43]！

不管怎麼說，這份號稱《東原二百年紀念號》的專號除21日外，從1月19日到25日6天連續發行，刊登出了如下6類文章。即(6)梁啓超〈戴東原先生傳〉(1月19日)、(7)梁啓超〈東原著述纂校書目考〉(1月19日、20日)、(8)陳展雲〈戴東原的天算學〉(1月22日~23日)、(9)梁啓超〈東原哲學〉(1月24日、25日)、(10)梁啓超〈東原圖書館緣起〉(1月25日)、(11)〈東原圖書館募捐辦法〉(1月25日)。1月19日紀念大會這一天的《晨報副鐫》首頁登出了戴震遺像啓。據〈緣起〉說，爲了這個紀念大會，整整花了半年時間去尋找「東原先生遺像」。「胡適之先生並到他的故鄉休寧去找也沒有找著」，「不料高曙青先生竟於紀念會前二三日找得一幀。」第五版面是「戴東原先生祠堂」，第六版面是「讀書處」，第七版面是三幅「故宅」照片。從照片上的解說詞得知，這三張照片是安徽第四女子師範學校程校長贈送的。這所學校是利用戴氏「讀書處」舊址開辦的，有學生一百八十多名；有兩千多名農民在該校接受了平民教育；胡適、梁啓超、陶行知等計劃發起、創辦「東原圖書館」等等。從1月25日公布的「東原圖書館緣起」「東原圖書館募捐辦法」中可以了解到，這個東原圖書館除戴震著書、「參與之著書」、「有關係之著書」之外，還有「師範學校應用之圖書雜誌報章」，「公眾閱覽之圖書雜誌報章、得視經濟狀況逐漸增備。」爲此募捐六萬元。「以二萬元爲建築費，二萬元爲第一次購備圖書雜誌報章費，二萬元爲逐年生息維持擴充之基金。」由此可見，戴震誕辰兩百周年紀念活動不

---

43 同上書，頁279。

僅僅彰顯了戴震的學問、思想、人物，同時引發了牽動戴震家鄉所有人物的一場知識性社會運動。

(8)陳展雲〈戴東原的天算學〉(1月22日～23日)

陳氏的基本觀點是，以戴震爲代表的學者「治學的精神都以『實事求是』『致用』爲歸。……治學的方法都帶有科學的態度；屏主觀而尙客觀；輕冥證而重實驗；……治學的精神和方法處處與歐洲文藝復興後的學者完全一致。」從這一立場出發，陳氏把明末清初以下三百年學術思想發展史，尤其是天文算學史劃分爲四個時期。即「西法初入中國」的「崇禎時代爲第一時期」，「清初到康雍時代爲第二時期，乾嘉時代爲第三時期，同光時代爲第四時期。」在這個基礎上，陳氏分析了戴震的科學思想，在「他治天算學的精神，他對於天算學重視的態度」、「他替我們所開闢的研究中國天算史的道理」，「他的天算學說(在當時的價值卻不可埋沒)」等三個側面上分析了戴震的天文學、數學。他指出：「東原對於古天算史上的貢獻有三」。「第一、是輯出許多古算書；第二、是給我們研究中國天文算學史的立了一種規模；使我們於研究上得到種種便利。第三、是對於古天算書的難明瞭的地方，予以新的解釋。」

(9)梁啓超〈東原哲學〉(1月24日、25日)

梁啓超的核心觀點是「東原學術，雖有多方面，然足以不朽的全在他的哲學。」這篇論文由如下十個部分組成。一、研究東原哲學之主要資料。二、著手研究東原哲學以前應注意的幾個問題。三、東原時代思想界的形勢及東原思想之淵源。四、東原哲學內容一：客觀的理義與主觀的意見。五、東原哲學內容二：情欲主義。六、東原哲學內容三：性的一元與二元。七、東原哲學內容四：命定與自由意志。八、東原哲學內容五：宇宙觀(暫闕)。九、東原哲學內容六：修養實踐談。十、東原

哲學的反響(暫闕)。據梁啓超說，戴震誕辰紀念大會「其初本是在舊曆十二月二十四日舉行的，後來議定換算陽曆，忽然提早十天，我越發趕不過來。爲「這一篇東原哲學，我是接連三十四點鐘不睡覺趕成。」然而，僅從目錄就可以看出，這篇論文幾乎綜括了後世考察、研究戴震哲學思想的所有課題。梁啓超其人其文果真是獨一無二。

慶祝戴震誕辰兩百周年的《東原二百年紀念號》停刊後，1924年4月，《戴東原二百生日紀念論文集》作爲晨報社叢書第十三種出版了。同年5月1日出版了《晨報副鐫》4月份合訂本第三十期。在合訂本的底封面刊登了如下的廣告文。

> 戴東原先生是清代考證學的大家。在我國學術界佔很重要的地位。這書是戴先生生日紀念，梁任公、陳展雲、汪震、吳時英、周良熙諸先生所著的論文。要知戴先生的學術，不可不看。且有戴先生遺像及插圖八張，每冊七角，寄費七分[44]。

從上述的文字中，可以看出在「整理國故」運動展開的過程，尤其是以戴震誕辰兩百周年紀念爲契機的戴震再評價活動中，戴震不是被作爲考證學家，而是被看成與西歐思想家平起平坐的哲學家，被放在近三百年乃至三千年中國思想史的發展過程裡來加以分析、比較和綜合研究的。無論是哪一篇論文無不洋溢著用「爲真理而求真理」的標準去批評戴震、從嶄新的視角重新認識戴震的意欲和氣魄。不僅如此，我個人胡適在〈整理國故的方法〉中闡述的「歷史的觀念、疑古的態度、系統的

---

44 《晨報副鐫》4月份合訂本第30期，1924年5月1日發行。這份4月份合訂本第30期底封面上登出了〈晨報社叢書〉15種類12冊書的廣告，在第13種裡寫有《戴東原二百年生日紀念論文集》這一書名。由此可知，本書於1924年4月出版。此外《晨報副鐫》3月份合訂本第29期(1924年4月1日發行)底封面的廣告只登出晨報社叢書第12種《智慧測量》這一書名。

研究、整理」[45] 這四個方法論被運用在戴震研究上。這是我個人的感受。就這樣，近代學術研究開始在亞洲第一個共和制中國以「整理國故」的形式開始發芽、開花。在這個意義上，重新評價戴震的活動即使在今天也還同樣具有深刻的含義。

遺憾的是，「整理國故」只因爲是胡適提出、發動的，直到近年爲止，在中國大陸被視爲反動的學術運動而遭到否定。

舉例來說，在中華人民共和國具有代表性的思想史學家侯外廬在1947年5月曾出版過一本書，叫《近代中國思想學說史》。該書有小標題爲〈戴東原學術的歷史地位何在？〉的一節。其中，承認「東原哲學是有時代的抗議精神的」，也對戴東原和胡適之表示了一定的敬意，對「整理國故」做了如下的比較得當的評價。

> 自章太炎以來，戴學在哲學方面始被人所注意。到了民國十二年，胡適之以皖人治皖學的態度，在北京安徽會館舉行一個東原的紀念會，出席講演者有梁任公、錢玄同、朱希祖諸人，當時整個一年期間，報紙副刊與雜誌上幾乎成為戴學的天下，在「整理國故」的風氣之下，戴學最為出風頭。適之的「戴東原哲學」一書，便是那時候的作品。經過了北伐以後，戴學便不甚被人高談。這又是什麼原故呢？原來，東原哲學是有時代的抗議精神的，因此在清代是不能抬頭，清末太炎尊戴，和他的反滿革命相為表裡，及乎民國十年前後，軍閥混戰，以曹錕賄選達於黑暗之頂點，在思想史上要求理性主義正是北平學術界的前進思想，與東原託於孟子相似，當時則託於東原，這是勢

45 胡適，〈研究國故的方法〉（在東南大學演講、枕薪筆記），《東方雜誌》第18卷第16卷（1921年8月20日發行），頁114-116。根據胡頌平編著，《胡適之先生年譜長編初稿》第2冊，頁407，這次「演講」不是在東南大學，而是「在南京高等師範學校舉辦第一期暑期學校的演講」。

之使然[46]。

九年後，即1956年8月，侯外廬在毛澤東統治下的中國出版了《中國早期啓蒙思想史》。然而，在該書第11章第2節〈戴震學說的歷史地位〉中，侯外廬爲適應當時大陸上鋪天蓋地而來的「胡適批判」這一政治氣候，對戴震、對胡適以及對「整理國故」的評價發生了一百八十度的轉變。前面引用的一段話被改寫爲如下的文字。

> 自炳麟開始，戴學在哲學方面才被人所注意。到了一九二三、一九二四年，胡適吹起皖人治皖學的法螺，還在北京安徽會館舉行了一個戴震的紀念會，出席講演的人有梁啓超、錢玄同、朱希祖等。當時整個的一年期間，官辦的報紙副刊與雜誌上幾乎成為戴學的天下。在所謂「整理國故」的反動風氣之下，戴學最出風頭。胡適的「戴東原的哲學」一書，便是那時候的作品。但經過了北伐以後，戴學便不甚被人談論了。這是什麼道理呢？原來，戴震哲學是有一定的時代的抗議精神的，因此，他在清代不能抬頭。清末章炳麟尊戴，這和他的反清精神相為表裡，是有積極的進步因素的。到了「五四」文化統一戰線內部分裂的時候，馬克思主義在中國的傳播和中國共產黨的成立，使得資產階級的文化領導和政治領導失去任何地位，而資

---

46 侯外廬，《近代中國思想學說史》上冊(生活書店，中華民國36〔1947)年5月勝利後第一版，香港波文書局影印本)，頁387。侯外廬在晚年的回憶錄〈坎坷的歷程〉當中就該書做了如下的敘述。「《中國近世思想學說史》(《近代中國思想學說史》)一書，差不多經過兩年的寫作時間，方才問世，這是一部跨越十六世紀中葉到清末民初的兩卷本思想史。如果說《中國古代思想學說史》是用馬克思主義的觀點、方法清理了古代重大變革時期——春秋戰國思想發展的路徑，那麼，《中國近世思想學說史》，則是用馬克思主義的觀點方法，草創了研究另一個重大變革時期——明清之際思想發展途徑的一種研究方式。」《中國哲學》第6輯(生活・讀書・新知三聯書店，1981年5月初版)，頁380。

產階級右派卻跑進了骨董堆中，一點一滴地宣揚實用主義去了。這些人託於戴震，企圖抵抗馬克思主義。……

胡適表面上提倡戴學，假裝著「打理學家」的招牌，實際上是想用時髦的唯心主義來代替陳舊的唯心主義，是想拿唯心的實用主義來曲解戴震在學術史上的本來面目[47]。

自此以後，三十餘年，這種見解在中國大陸極其普遍，成了一般觀點[48]。研究人員對胡適本人也好，對胡適所作的「整理國故」也好，都敬而遠之，不加研究。即便涉及到，也只是予以否定性的批判。毫不誇張地說，以真摯的態度加以分析，正當地進行評價的研究，就是到了

---

47 侯外廬，《中國早期啓蒙思想史——十七世紀至十九世紀四十年代》（人民出版社，1956年8月初版），頁459-460。

48 比如說，李長之，〈胡適的思想面貌和國故整理〉劈頭就是「胡適是什麼樣的人？胡適是一個頑固的反革命分子」。文章還說：「胡適整理國故的一方面的意義：抵制馬克思列寧主義革命理論的傳播，宣傳帝國主義奴化思想，誣衊中國人民革命運動，鼓吹極端個人主義。但是胡適整理國故的另一方面意義乃是誘惑青年脫離現實的鬥爭。……胡適整理國故作用的兩翼：一方面宣傳帝國主義的奴化思想，一方面誘惑青年用繁瑣主義、形式主義、趣味主義脫離現實鬥爭。兩翼是相互為用的，因而目的是一個：達到民族虛無主義，向帝國主義屈膝。（《胡適批判》，第一輯〔生活・讀書・新知三聯書店，1955年1月初版〕，頁218-220）。還有安正輝選注《戴震哲學著作選注》（中華書局，1979年3月初版）〈前言〉也論述道：「辛亥革命，特別是五四運動後，隨著中國革命的進一步深入，一些反動的知識人也在戴震哲學上大做文章。早在辛亥革命後不久，梁啓超就在《清代學術概論》一文中，胡說戴震是「以情感哲學代理性哲學」。1923年梁啓超又與胡適等人，藉「慶祝」戴震誕生二百年的機會，進一步兜售這種謬論。胡適則更加狡猾地在戴震哲學上做文章。他胡說戴震哲學是顏元的「很徹底的實用主義」，和顧炎武的經學「二者結合的產兒」，戴震反理學鬥爭是「用窮理致知的學說來反攻程朱」，戴震的考據學是「一種實證的求知的方法」，是「那個時代的科學精神」。別有用心地吹捧戴震是「朱子以後第一個大思想家、大哲學家」。胡適這樣做，其目的是妄圖為其從美國販來的實用主義哲學提供歷史根據，誘騙知識青年去走他當時提出的「整理國故」的反動道路，來抵制馬克思主義在我國的傳播。」（頁16）。

1990年代依然沒有出現[49]。我在報告的開始就列舉了評估近代化的六項指標。實際上，應該加上第七個指標。這就是在學術研究上，不從屬於政治的「爲真理而求真理」的學問的成立！這個指標在推動國家、社會的近代化上比任何東西都更寶貴。從這個觀點來說，胡適正是在民國初年的中國爲確立近代學術的方法論立下了汗馬功勞，胡適是一個永遠不應被忘卻的人物。

（六）

以上是我的報告內容。最後，簡要地概括一下本稿所討論的問題，權且作爲結論，希望能起到拋磚引玉的效果。

(1)對中國傳統思想的重新探討是具有對研究對象進行批判的精神和余英時師所說的「一種客觀認知的精神」的近代學術研究活動。它發端於胡適《中國哲學史大綱(上)》，在1910年代末到20年代初以「整理國故」這一運動形式表現出來。

(2)「整理國故」運動結下了重新評價傳統思想的果實。這一過程以清末的《國粹學報》、章炳麟的《國故論衡》爲出發點，又以對五四新文化運動的思想上的反動以及心理上的厭惡爲契機，「整理國故」運動得以開展。其中存在著《國故》月刊、《四存月刊》等保守派、胡適等人的思想史研究派、文學史研究派、疑古派的歷史研究派等四個派

49 易竹賢，《胡適傳》（湖北人民出版社、1987年4月初版）比較客觀地描述了胡適的一生，但還是不能揭下「胡適是五四新文化運動中右翼的代表」，「最後成為蔣介石國民黨政府的『過河卒子』」，「成了人民中國的反對派」等政治標籤。依鄙見，開始恰當地評價胡適的是復旦大學的年輕學者章清的《胡適評傳》（百花洲文藝出版社[國學大師叢書1]，1992年8月初版）。章清寫道：「我想強調的是，一向被視為「全盤西化」鼻祖和文化虛無主義代表的胡適，在熱情介紹西方價值於中國時，還深深地關懷著中國文化中國學術的前途和命運：不僅現代中國的學術領域許多是由胡適開創的，而且其觀點甚至在今天還在我們學術研究中持久地發揮著重要的影響。」（頁328）

別。

(3)「國故」與「國學」的詞源問題。「國學」是於1920年代作爲「國故學」的略稱而固定下來的。而「國學」這一語詞是20世紀初，總數超過2萬人的留日中國學生和具有改革志向的知識分子有意無意地受到江戶時期日本國學者的影響，取其把獨自的傳統學術視爲自我認同依據之義。

(4)1923年秋，作爲「整理國故」運動的一環，重新評價戴震活動開展得轟轟烈烈。一系列有關戴震的思想、著述、人物的研究和介紹集中刊登在《晨報副鐫》上。於是，不是作爲皖派的考證學家，而是作爲精通天文學和數學的哲學家、肯定欲望的思想家的現代戴震形象就這樣樹立起來了。

(5)留美歸來的胡適的「整理國故」運動實際上把章炳麟、劉師培等清朝考證學的傳統與歐美的學術傳統(美國的實用主義、德國的實證主義史學)綜合在一起，打下了現代中國學院式學術研究的基礎。今天的報告雖有不足之嫌，但我們清楚地看到：「整理國故」運動意味著近代學術研究的成立。

(6)我今天一開始就列舉了評估近代化的6項指標。在此，我再次重申：胡適在「整理國故」運動中提出來的口號。「爲真理而求真理」應當作爲第七個指標，並以此來判斷和測試各國的近代化程度和應有的狀態。而在「政治掛帥」這樣一種學術服務於、從屬於政治的體制之下，真正的近代化的實現是何等的艱難啊！

後記：本文中的「近代化」一詞係英語“Modernization”的翻譯，其意義與中國學者常用的「現代化」一詞大體上是一致的。

Some Thoughts on the Significance of Confucianism in the New Millenium

Fong-ching Chen
Director of Institute of Chinese Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

A. The Modern Fate of Confucianism

It is a cliché that the world has been fast changing, and we are now on the threshold of a veritable brave new world. The pace at which it is being transformed during the past decade is quite beyond what anyone could have foreseen or even imagined half a century ago, and if the prophecy of leading scientists and technologists is not totally dismissed [1], then human society will change beyond all recognition in half a century from now on. It is therefore a recurring theme in speculations on the future how much of the traditional value system, the great religions and philosophies which emerged during the

1 See, for instance, the "End-of -the -Millenium Special Issue" of *Scientific American*, December 1999.

Axial Age and subsequently had so dominated human consciousness, can continue to survive and be found meaningful in the new millennium which has just dawned on us. For a philosophical system anchored to and totally fused with its historical socio-political settings such as Confucianism, this poses a particularly acute question, whereas religions with a transcendental foundation such as Christianity or Islam would not be affected to the same extent.

Thus Prof. Yu Ying-shih once characterized contemporary Confucianism as a "wandering spirit"游魂, not in a derogatory sense, but rather to bring out the simple fact that "the links between Confucianism with (socio-political) institutions have been broken, and institutionalized Confucianism is dead," therefore "the age in which Confucianism was able to dominate Chinese social order through established institutions is forever gone."[2] In his view, efforts to resurrect Confucianism by "rehabilitating the spirit in a borrowed body"借屍還魂are questionable, and not likely to succeed. Consequently the only real future for Confucianism lies with what it can offer in the private rather than the public sphere, that is, in its role as a system of personal ethic and life attitude. In other words, one should now confine oneself to the *xiushen* 修身 component in the *xiuqizhiping* 修齊治平 formula, and the *neisheng* 內聖 component in the *neisheng waiwang* 內聖外王 formula for inspirations. He further pointed out that there has already been a historical antecedent to such a strategy: under immense pressure of the Ming imperial court, which regularly meted out draconian punishments to its scholar-officials, Wang Yang-ming and many other Confucianists started to back away from socio-political issues which had pre-occupied Song Confucianists

2 余英時，《現代儒學論》（八方文化企業公司，1996），頁162-63及173。

such as Zhu Xi and increasingly turned their attention towards "private" issues, namely personal edification and the proper ordering of the individual daily life; and the trend continued into Qing Dynasty, which was no less oppressive, although in a more subtle way.[3]

Most scholars would no doubt consider the above view reasonable, even though contemporary Neo-Confucianists would probably find it much too narrow, and would want to emphasize instead the vitality of Confucianism and its potential as a general principle on which a more balanced and harmonious future world order can be constructed.[4] Whether such a grand vision with its metaphysical and religious overtones can be realized remains to be seen. What we intend to discuss here is something far more modest. We wish to draw attention to the fact that, within the original Confucian classics, namely *The Analects* and *Mencius*, there are a number of well-known precepts which deal with neither personal ethic and life attitude nor socio-political institutions of a single state, but are rather concerned with inter-state, that is, *international* issues, with *tianxia* or the entire civilized world as the arena. Is it then possible that Confucianism, born during a period of transition between the disintegration of the Zhou universal world order and the emergence of highly centralized territorial states, may yet have something significant to say today beyond the private sphere--for instance, on international politics? That is the problem we want to explore in this

---

3 余英時，《現代儒學論》，頁37-43及174-79。

4 杜維明主編，《儒學發展的宏觀透視》（台北：正中書局，1997)is the proceedings of the 1988 Singapore conference on Confucianism and provides a wide spectrum of views on the matter; more recent views of leading neo-confucianists are found in杜維明，《現代精神與儒家傳統》（台北：聯經出版社，1996)；劉述先，《儒家思想與現代世界》（台北：中央研究院，1997)；林安梧主編，《當代儒家發展之新契機》（台北：文津出版社，1997)。

presentation.

B. To Attract Talents from Afar

To illustrate what I mean, let me start with a familiar passage from Confucius himself: "When distant subjects are un-submissive one cultivates one's moral quality in order to attract them, and once they have come one makes them content."[5] Obviously, this particular precept is not likely to appeal to the modern reader by its condescending tone and paternalistic attitude. However, it would appear in a different light if we think of the highly effective manner in which the United States attracts and makes use of the best talents from all over the world. Furthermore, that attraction does not arise so much from the lure of national prestige or immediate personal gains, although both do have some effects, as from a general perception that that country is a land of freedom and opportunity, where one's well-being would be looked after in the long run. Is not that precisely what Confucius counseled in the above passage from the *Analects* if it is to be understood in the modern context?

In fact, as is only too well known, the phenomenal strength of the United States has always been derived in no small measure from its attraction to immigrants, particularly during the upheaval of the 1930's. What happens today is but the continuation of a great tradition. The economic take-off of Taiwan teaches a similar lesson, for it was also the result of a successful policy in attracting a large flux of "reverse immigrants" from the United

5 D. C. Lau, trans., *The Analects*(Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1992), XVI. 1

States. China itself, too, after two decades of sending an ever expanding stream of her best talents for studies abroad, is now waking up to need of luring them home after they finish their studies, and has begun to adjust its thinking and policy accordingly. In the upcoming information age, which we are told will be dominated by the knowledge industry, the international competition for talents from afar can only intensify, and it would be puzzling if one does not find Confucianism highly relevant in that regard.

C. The Unification of Tianxia

Next let us turn to the famous exchange between King Xiang of Liang 梁襄王 and Mencius. To the weighty question "Through what can the Empire(*tianxia* 天下)be settled?", the master philosopher answered "Through unity", and to the natural follow-up question, "Who can unite it?", he went straight to the heart of the matter: "One who is not fond of killing can unite it."[6] Again, this formula for uniting *tianxia* would not strike us as terribly sophisticated, and may seem to bear little relevance to our age. Yet an entirely different picture would also emerge as soon as we turn our attention to two recent international transformations. The first is the emergence of the European Community, a dream which had animated a long list of ambitious men from Charlemagne onward for over twelve centuries, but had eluded them all despite the endless bloody wars they resorted to in pursuit of that dream. However, through the vision and persistence of a few farsighted statesmen, who turned to persuasion and negotiation instead, it has now

6 D. C. Lau, transl., *Mencius*(Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1984), vol. I, IA. 6 & IA. 7.

largely come true within but half a century after the initation of the project. The second transformation is, of course, the tide of globalization, in which the entire world is being rapidly and relatively painlessly integrated through trade and technology rather than by feat of arms. Both are important steps towards world unity, which men have learned to take only after some very costly lessons in history.

It is of course somewhat ironic that Mencius was *not* vindicated by Chinese history: *tianxia* was unified a century after his time by someone who did not at all recoil from mass killings, and Confucianism only acquired its position of orthodoxy long after the emergence of a unified empire in China. Nevertheless, this does not detract from the fact that Confucianism is basically pacifist in its tenets, and that even in its later stages of development as an imperial ideology it never acquired a warlike mentality such as the Christian Church did after it became firmly established in Western Europe. Never known for their missionary zeal or martial spirits, Confucianists always looked upon imperial expansionist policy with aversion, as something wasteful and of no lasting value, with the miseries it wrought on common people as the only assured consequence. The Crusades and the forced conversions waged by the *conquistadores* would be quite unthinkable to them whether in concept or in practice.

This ingrained pacifist attitude can best be understood through Mencius' well-known dichotomy of approaches to international relations: *Wangdao* 王道，the way of the true king who "puts benevolence into effect through the transforming influence of morality", in contradistinction to *Badao* 霸道，the way of the hegemon who "uses force while borrowing from benevolence".[7]

---

7 *Mencius*, *op. cit.*, IIA. 3.

In his view, the key concept to the unification of *tianxia* is benevolence 仁, or a genuine concern for the true interest of the *other*, which would engender fruitful and long lasting relationships among different states; in contrast, dominance in the international arena achieved through a combination of power and the mere appearance of good could have no permanent effect. In our age, such views are probably considered to be hopelessly idealistic and out of touch with *realpolitik*, hardly worth serious consideration as the foundation of the foreign policy of a major power. That is not surprising, for elected governments usually formulate policies by looking ahead no more than the term of its administration, that is, a decade or so, whereas to realize the vision of Mencius would take at least two or three generations, that is, half to one century. Thus, for our speculations here to be meaningful at all, the latter time scale is what we would have to keep in mind.

D. The Burning Issue of the Day

Having thus tried to relate some Confucian teachings to modern issues, we should now deal with a natural objection: even if certain ideas in classics do seem to have modern relevance, how can we be sure of their true significance? After all, the Democritean atom has precious little to do with its modern counter part, and historically was not the idea which gave rise to the latter. Similarly, as often pointed out, even though certain well-known passages in *Mencius* elevating common people above kings and ministers are germane to democracy, they do not necessarily constitute a sound foundation on which to develop that institution. The answer to this objection is, atomic theory and democratic institutions are now highly developed and have amply proven their worth, so it is safe to assume there is little if anything the

ancients can still offer in those areas. But the same can hardly be said of international relations, which are still in a state of flux, and in the foreseeable future would follow no fixed pattern or path of development.

In saying this we are keenly aware of the fact that, in the wake of World War Two, an elaborate and rapidly expanding system of treaties and institutions has been built up by the West in order to deal with a host of international issues, and its importance and effectiveness have further increased since the end of the cold war about a decade ago, to such an extent that sometimes one gets the illusion that a proto-type world government is already in the making. However, that should not blind us to the simple fact that this system is quite powerless, indeed irrelevant, when what a major power regards as its vital interest is at stake. This should have been brought home by two recent unilateral decisions of the United States, the leader of the West: the *de facto* if not yet formal abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972, and the refusal to subscribe to the Kyoto accord on greenhouse gas emission, in disregard of and to the dismay of the rest of the world, her Western allies included. These two events, concerning global security and environment respectively, are not incidental, but symptomatic of our age, in which ever accelerating scientific and technological developments have shrunk the world so drastically that all nations have been forced into close interaction with one another, and their eventual coalescence into a single body has now become a distinct possibility.

It is true that the realization, indeed acceptance, first by China and then by Russia, of the advantages offered by the socio-economic-political institutions of the West was a major turning point in the second half of the twentieth century, which effectively brought the ideological conflict to an end and opened the gate to the tide of globalization. However, as recent

events have demonstrated, that by no means brought an end to continued conflicts among nations. It is true that the cause of such conflicts has changed, from ideology to simple self-interest, and the battlefield has shifted from military to economic and political spheres, yet the conflicts are no less real, for the intensity and ramifications of the "battles" fought have actually far exceeded anything known in history.[8] Thus the world is now thrown back to a familiar political situation, like that of the nineteenth century Europe or Warring States period China, during which a large number of states having broadly comparable structure and goals but unequal strength vied for ascendancy.

Thus we again find ourselves in an age wherein *tianxia* can only be "settled" through some sort of unification, although probably not anything as visibly brutal as the Qin military conquest in third century B.C. That is the burning issue of the day, and more or less the same issue addressed by Mencius in his times. To be sure, at this stage globalization is still mainly commercial and economic in character. However, a little reflection should convince us that its ever deepening administrative, legal, cultural and political implications would eventually lead to a comprehensive integration in all essential institutions and important spheres of human activity. While local variations in language, religion, customs, etc. may persist, they would become increasingly marginalized, turning into a matter of fashion and taste

---

8 Huntington's thesis on 'the clash of civilizations'(see note 11 below)is somewhat puzzling, for at least two of the major civilizations on his list, namely the Eeastern Orthodox and the Confucian, have never been known through their teachings for military tendencies or propensities for engaging in conflicts. Ascribing the conflicts which nowaday Russia or China may get involved in with the West to their civilizations merely cover the true cause of those conflicts, making their proper understanding that much more difficult.

rather than identity and constitution. The only question then left would be the eventual form such integration would take, in particular, whether it would be totally shaped by the special interests of a particular geopolitical bloc or power.

E. Would a Superpower Continue to Dominate?

The emergence of the United States as the one single superpower during the last decade of the twentieth century and her current lead in scientific and technological strength as well as military might has put her in a position probably stronger than even that of Great Britain after the defeat of Napolean, and gave rise to speculations that the end of history might be in sight.[9] Under the circumstance, it is all but natural that there should be strong temptation for her to try perpetuating an international order which would preserve that lead. According to Paul Kennedy[10], such an effort might be futile, since the balance of strength among great powers never stands still, and the relatively small population of the United States as compared with, say, China would eventually turn the balance against her. However, history rarely repeats itself or subjects itself to neat analysis, so Kennedy may prove to be quite wrong, and the United States or the West as a power bloc may actually retain its leading position throughout the twenty-first century. If that turns out to be the case, what would happen to the rest of the world with its immense population and rising nationalistic feelings? Can they be genuinely "settled" and induced or otherwise forced to accept a hierarchical world order

9 Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*(New York: The Free Press, 1992).

10 Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of Great Powers*(New York: Vintage Books, 1989).

indefinitely?

Quite naturally, those weighty issues have been a central concern to statesmen as well as scholars, a good example being Samuel Huntington, who has caused considerable reverberations around the world by his provocative views and analysis[11]. In the event, can we still expect the relatively simple but not simple-minded teachings of ancient sages, those well-worn paths of wisdom, to make a real difference in these matters? The simple answer to that question is, political scientists are very much like governments(which after all form one of the most important sectors of their audience) in their tendency to work on short-term issues, and as a consequence normally confine their views to time scales of one or two decades at most, relegating possibilities and eventualities beyond that time frame to the realm of philosophical speculations. On that account, it would seem unjustified, at least too hasty, to dismiss the ancient sages out of hand as yet.

Let us now return to Mencius and his conviction that *tianxia* should, indeed can, be unified and "settled" entirely through good will and peaceful means. How can that be taken seriously, as something more than a pious wish? After all, after more than half a century, the highly hierarchical and divisive world order built up by the West since World War II seems more durable and successful than ever, and is being reinforced rather than eroded by the process of globalization. In our view, the basic reason for advocating or even expecting a fundamental change from the existing order is the following: genuine and long-lasting integration of the world necessarily implies a significant reduction in the disparity of wealth and strength among

---

11 Samuel P. Hungtington, "The Clash of Civilizations?", *Foreign Affairs*(New York, Summer 1993), pp. 22-37.

different populations, both within and *among* different nations. In other words, democracy and social justice within a limited number of states is insufficient: there would also have to be broad parity and justice among different nations or geopolitical blocs, should such continue to exist.

Undeniably this would work against the relative position of the stronger powers, which would therefore strongly oppose it out of short-term self-interest. However, for all their strength they may have no alternative in the end, because of pressure arising from the inner dynamics of globalization, which demands ever more intensive integration on all fronts in the interest of further expansion of the market, and for the sake of greater efficiency. In other words, just as democracy is necessary for a stable and economically efficient modern state, so the perception and choice of the common people throughout the world as to where their real interests lie are also essential to a truly integrated and stable world order. And this would remain the case despite the apparent permanency of current institutions and their ideological underpinnings, which seem to be able to dominate world thinking so successively at the moment.[12] Therein lies the basic reason why the common people rather than current institutions are the key to the future of *tianxia*, and why the precepts of Confucianism, although simple and well-known, may yet

---

12 By "current institutions" we are referring to both international agencies such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, etc. as well as multinational corporations. It is of course the latter which are the real power and driving force behind globalization, and which directly impinge on the environment and the daily life of common people, often with serious consequences. For further discussions on this problem, see Peter Nolan, "Will Large-Scale Enterprises of China Stand Any Chance?", *Twenty-First Century* no.59(Hong Kong, June 2000), pp. 5-19; Kevin Phillips, *The Politics of Rich and Poor*(New York: Harper Perennial, 1990); and David C. Korten, *When Corporations Rule the World* (Bloomfield, Conn: Kumarian Press & San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2001).

have something highly significant to offer the world (and not just the individual) in the new millennium.

Postscript

It was more than forty years ago that I first met the young Yu Ying-shih in Cambridge, when he was a graduate student working on his thesis and I an undergraduate studying physics. We chatted about Collingwood and Trevelyan, and the love of *weiqi* further drew us together, even though I was not quite a match for him in either pastime. Our path next crossed in the early seventies, when he chaired and I sat on a committee for restructuring the Chinese University, meeting weekly for a whole year. That was a traumatic experience, which made us (and all those who went through it as well) feel like life-long comrades-in-arms thereafter. It was therefore all but natural that I should, when through an unexpected turn of fate finding myself working at the Institute of Chinese Studies, turn to him for help and advice in the late eighties, and do so again in the early nineties after the founding of *Twenty-First Century* bimonthly, of which he has remained a loyal Editorial Board member, contributor and reader ever since. These connections provided good excuse for many happy sojourns to Princeton throughout the past fifteen years, even though my *weiqi* handicap never improved. I was therefore greatly honored and truly delighted to be invited to the symposium honoring Professor Yu upon his retirement, and hope that this paper would serve as a small token of my admiration and friendship for him, as well as a modest tribute to his stature as a leading scholar-intellectual in the grand Chinese tradition. However, in so doing I am only too keenly aware of my limitations: as he himself is so fond of putting it, I have but "talked about the *xianglun* in

front of the pagoda"對塔說相輪，and never really "got inside the pagoda and labored up its stairs"直入塔中，辛勤登攀，with little hope of ever "getting near the *xianglun*"去相輪漸近. Nevertheless, knowing Professor Yu, I rest assured he would accept this token with characteristic tolerance and good humor.

May 1,2001
Revised June 30, 2001

余英時先生主要著作目錄

一、中文部分

甲、專書

1.《近代文明的新趨勢》(香港：自由出版社，1953)。
2.《民主制度的發展》(香港：亞洲出版社，1954)。
   以上二書合刊為《西方民主制度與近代文明》(台中：漢新出版社，1984)。
3.《民主革命論》(香港：自由出版社，1954；台北：九思出版社重印本，1979)。
4.《到思維之路》(香港：高原出版社，1954；台中：漢新出版社重印本，1984)。
5.《自由與平等之間》(香港：自由出版社，1955；台中：漢新出版社重印本易名《自由與平等》，1984)。
6.《文明論衡》(香港：高原出版社，1955；台北：九思出版社重印本，1979)。
7.《方以智晚節考》(香港：新亞研究所，1972；台北：允晨文化公司增訂擴大版，1986)。

8.《歷史與思想》(台北：聯經出版事業公司，1976)。

9.《論戴震與章學誠：清代中期學術思想史研究》(香港：龍門書店，1976；台北：華世出版社重印本，1980；台北：東大圖書公司增訂本，1996)。

10.《紅樓夢的兩個世界》(台北：聯經出版事業公司，1978；1981年增訂再版)。

11.《中國知識階層史論：古代篇》(台北：聯經出版事業公司，1980)。

12.《史學與傳統》(台北：時報文化出版公司，1982)。

13.《中國近代思想史上的胡適》(台北：聯經出版事業公司，1984)。

14.《從價值系統看中國文化的現代意義》(台北：時報文化出版公司，1984)。

按：此書有英文簡介，見*Heaven Earth, the Chinese Art of Living, Journal of Fine Arts Inner Arts* I. 1 (May 1991, San Francisco)；德文譯本見Martin Miller, *Die Moderität der Tradition, Zum Kulturveständnis des Chineisischen Historikers Yu Yingshi* (Münster: Lit, 1995), pp. 59-121.

15.《中國近世宗教倫理與商人精神》(台北：聯經出版事業公司，1987；森紀子日譯本，東京：平凡社，1991；鄭仁在韓譯本，大韓教科書株式會社，1993)。

16.《士與中國文化》(上海：上海人民出版社，1987)。

17.《中國思想傳統的現代詮釋》(台北：聯經出版事業公司，1987。)

按：南京江蘇人民出版社1989年本為一名同實異的論文集，列入《海外中國研究叢書》。

18.《文化評論與中國情懷》(台北：允晨文化公司，1990)。

19.《猶記風吹水上鱗：錢穆與現代中國學術》(台北：三民書局，1991；上海：遠東出版社1994年本《錢穆與中國文化》，內容略有不同)。

20.《內在超越之路：余英時新儒學論著輯要》（北京：中國廣播電視出版社，1992）。
21.《中國文化與現代變遷》（台北：三民書局，1992）。
22.《民主與兩岸動向》（台北：三民書局，1993）。
23.《歷史人物與文化危機》（台北：東大圖書公司，1995）。
24.《現代儒學論》（美國紐澤西：八方文化企業公司，1996；上海：上海人民出版社1998年本，有增訂）。
25.《中國知識分子論》（康正果編）(河南人民出版社，1997)。
26.《陳寅恪晚年詩文釋證》（台北：東大圖書公司，1998）。
27.《論士衡史》（傅杰編）(上海：文藝出版社，1999)。

乙、論文

＊已收入專書與論集中的論文，不再列目。以下所選是1992-2000年間有關學術與文化的散篇文字。

1.〈中國知識人之史的考察〉，《中華文化的過去、現在和未來——中華書局八十週年紀念論文集》（台北：中華書局，1992），頁458-476。
2.〈歷史女神的新文化動向與亞洲傳統的再發現〉，《九州學刊》5.2(1992)：5-18。
3.〈明清變遷時期社會與文化的轉變〉，余英時等著，《中國歷史轉型時期的知識分子》（台北：聯經出版事業公司，1992），頁35-42。
4.〈王僧虔〈誡子書〉與南朝清談考辨〉，《中央研究院中國文哲研究集刊》3(1993)：173-196；又見湯一介編，《國故新知：中國傳統文化的再詮釋》（湯用彤先生誕辰百周年紀念論文集）(北京：北京大學出版社，1993)，頁173-183。

5.〈章學誠文史校讎考論〉，《中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊》64.1(1993)；205-221；又收在北京《中國文化》10(1994)：27-36及四川大學歷史系編，《冰繭彩絲集》(紀念繆鉞教授九十壽辰暨從教七十年論文集)(成都出版社，1994)，頁493-514。

6.〈《錢穆與中國文化》自序〉，《學術集林》(上海：遠東出版社，1994)，頁223-229。

7.〈我走過的路〉，《關西大學中國文學會紀要》16(日本大阪，1995)：1-9。

8.〈談中國當前的文化認同問題〉，香港中文大學中國文化研究所，《二十一世紀》31(1995)：13-15。

9.〈追憶牟宗三先生〉，台北，《中國時報》，1995.4.20，11版。

10.〈文化危機與民族認同〉，《學術集林》卷七(上海：遠東出版社，1996)，頁63-92。

11.〈中國史學界的樸實楷模——敬悼嚴耕望學長〉，台北，《聯合報》，1996.10.22-23，37版；收入嚴耕望先生紀念集編輯委員會編，《充實而有光輝——嚴耕望先生紀念集》，台北：稻禾出版社，1997，頁35-44。

12.〈《朱熹的思維世界》(田浩著)序〉(台北：允晨文化公司，1996)，頁3-8。

13.〈明清小說與民間文化——《和風堂新文集》序〉，台北，《聯合文學》12.11(1996)：14-26；柳存仁，《和風堂新文集》(台北：新文豐出版公司，1997)，頁1-23。

14.〈《郭廷以、費正清、韋慕庭——臺灣與美國學術交流個案初探》(張朋園著)序〉，《中央研究院近代史研究所專刊》80(台北，1997)，頁i-vi。

15.〈1997思前想後〉，《二十一世紀》41(1997)：4-8。

16.〈漂流：古今中外知識人的命運〉(劉再復《西尋故鄉》序)，台

北，《聯合報》副刊，1997.5.8-9；《西尋故鄉》(香港：天地圖書公司，1997)，頁1-8。

17.〈東西方漢學和《東西方漢學思想史》〉，香港，《明報月刊》32.12(1997)：110-111；又見北京，《世界漢學》創刊號(1998)：190-193。

18.〈《煮酒論思潮》(陳奎德著)序〉(台北：東大圖書公司，1997)，頁1-8。

19.〈俠與中國文化〉，劉紹銘、陳永明編，《武俠小說論卷》上冊(香港：明河社，1998)，頁4-76。

20.〈士商互動與儒學轉向——明清社會史與思想史之一面相〉，郝延平、魏秀梅主編，《近世中國之傳統與蛻變：劉廣京院士七十五歲祝壽論文集》上冊(台北：中央研究院近代史研究所，1998)，頁3-52。

21.〈戊戌政變今讀〉，《二十一世紀》45(1998)：4-14。

22.〈論學談詩二十年——關於《胡適與楊聯陞往來書札》〉，台北，《聯合報》副刊，1998.2.22-23；《論學談詩二十年——胡適與楊聯陞往來書札・序》(台北：聯經出版事業公司，1998)，頁i-xii。

23.〈香港的自由與學術文化〉，《明報月刊》33.3(1998)：15-16。

24.〈《朱熹哲學思想》(金春峰著)序〉(台北：東大圖書公司，1998)，頁1-4。

25.〈《自由鳥》(鄭義著)序〉(台北：三民書局，1998)，頁1-7。

26.〈我所認識的錢鍾書先生〉，台北，《中國時報》，1998.12.24，14版；又見《文匯讀書周報》1999.1.2，9版(上海：文匯新民聯合報業集團出版)。

27.〈朱熹哲學體系中的道德與知識〉，收在賀照田主編，《學術思想評論》第五輯(瀋陽：遼寧大學出版社，1999)，頁352-375。

28.〈文藝復興乎？啓蒙運動乎？——一個史學家對五四運動的反

思〉，收在余英時等著，《五四新論：既非文藝復興亦非啓蒙運動》(台北：聯經出版事業公司，1999)，頁1-31。
29.〈嚴復與中國古典文化〉，台北，《聯合報》，1999.7.11-12，37版。
30.〈《共產中國五十年》序〉，金鐘主編，《共產中國五十年，1949-1999》(香港：開放雜誌社，1999)，頁1-7。
31.〈商業社會中士人精神的再造〉，台北，《聯合報》副刊，1999.9.12-13。
32.〈讓一部分人在精神上先富起來！〉，《二十一世紀》56(1999)：10-14。
33.〈學術思想史的創建及流變：從胡適與傅斯年說起〉，《古今論衡》3(1999)：66-75。
34.〈多元化與普遍價值的尋求——祝台灣大學七十週年校慶〉，黃俊傑、何寄澎主編，《臺灣的文化發展——世紀之交的省思》(台北：國立台灣大學，1999)，頁1-9。
35.〈《朱子文集》序〉，陳俊民校編，《朱子文集》(共十冊)(台北：德富文教基金會，2000)，冊一，頁13-26；又刊於瀋陽：遼寧教育出版社，《萬象》2.9(2000)：1-13，題爲〈談宋代政治文化的三個階段〉。
36.〈軸心突破與禮樂傳統〉，《二十一世紀》58(2000)：17-28。
37〈「王道」在今天的世界〉，馬鶴凌編著，《文明融合與世界大同》(台北：台灣中華書局，2000)，頁139-147。
38.〈新亞精神與中國文化〉，劉述先主編，《中國文化的檢討與前瞻・序》(新亞叢書之四)(新加坡：世界科技出版公司，2000)；又見台北，《聯合報》副刊，2000.10.24-25。
39.〈重振獨立自主的人格〉，香港，《明報月刊》35.1(2000)：18-20。
40.〈打破「西方民主」的迷思〉，阮銘，《民主在台灣・序》(台北：

遠流出版事業公司，2000），頁I-IV。

41.〈「天地閉・賢人隱」的十年〉，《二十一世紀》61(2000)：4-6。

二、外文部分

A. Books

1. *Views of Life and Death in Later Han China* (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1962).
2. *Trade and Expansion in Han China, A Study in the Structure of Sino-Barbarian Economic Relations* (Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press, 1967).
3. *Early Chinese History in the People's Republic of China*. Editor and principal author (Seattle: School of International Studies, University of Washington, 1981).
4. *The Power of Culture, Studies in Chinese Cultural History*. Co-editor (with Willard J. Peterson and Andrew H. Plaks)(Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press, 1994).

B. Articles

1. "Life and Immortality in the Mind of Han China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 25(1964-65): 80-122.
2. A review article on D.C. Twitchett, *Financial Administration under the T'ang Dynasty*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 84.1(1964): 71-82.
3. "The Two Worlds of *Hung-lou meng*,"(tr. by Diana Yu), *The Renditions-English Translation Magazine* (The Chinese University of Hong Kong),

No. 2 (Spring 1974): 5-22.

4. "Some Preliminary Observations on the Rise of Ch'ing Confucian Intellectualism," *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, New Series XI.1/2 (December 1975): 105-144.
5. "Han," in K. C. Chang, ed., *Food in Chinese Culture, Anthropological and Historical Perspectives* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1977), pp. 53-83.
6. "Toward an Interpretation of the Intellectual Transition in Seventeenth-century China," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 100.2(1980): 115-125.
7. "New Evidence on the Early Chinese Conception of Afterlife," *Journal of Asian Studies* XLI.1 (November 1981): 81-85.
8. "Tai Chen and the Chu Hsi Tradition," in Chan Ping-leung, ed., *Essays in Commemoration of the Golden Jubilee of the Fung Ping Shan Library, Studies in Chinese Librarianship, Literature, Language, History and Arts* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1982), pp. 376-392.
9. "The Study of Chinese History: Retrospect and Prospect," in George Kao, ed., *The Translation of Things Past, Chinese History and Historiography* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press, 1982), pp. 7-26.
10. "The Seating Order at the Hung-men Banquet," in George Kao, ed., *The Translation of Things Past, Chinese History and Historiography*, pp. 49-61.
11. "Individualism and Neo-Taoist Movement in Wei-Chin China," in Donald Munro, ed., *Individualism and Holism: Studies in Confucian and Taoist Values* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1985), pp. 121-155.

12. "T'ung-ch'eng School," in William H. Nienhauser Jr., editor and compiler, *The Indiana Companion to Traditional Chinese Literature* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1986), pp. 837-840.
13. "Morality and Knowledge in Chu Hsi's Philosophical System," in Wing-tsit Chan, ed., *Chu Hsi and Neo-Confucianism* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), pp. 228-254.
14. "Han Foreign Relations," in Denis Twitchett and Michael Loewe, eds., *The Cambridge History of China, vol. I: The Ch'in and Han Empires, 221B.C.-A.D.220* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 377-462.
15. " 'O Soul, Come Back! ' A Study in the Changing Conceptions of the Soul and Afterlife in Pre-Buddhist China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 47.2 (December 1987): 363-395.
16. "The Intellectual World of Chiao Hung Revisited," *Ming Studies* 25 (Spring 1988): 24-66.
17. "Tai Chen's Choice between Philosophy and Philology," *Asia Major*, Third Series, 2.1(1989): 79-108.
18. "Sun Yat-sen's Doctrine and Traditional Chinese Culture," in Chu-yuan Cheng, ed., *Sun Yat-sen's Doctrine and the Modern World* (Boulder & London: Westview Press, 1989), pp. 79-102.
19. "The Hsiung-nu," in Denis Sinor, ed., *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 118-150.
20. "Clio's New Cultural Turn and the Rediscovery of Tradition in Asia,"(*A Keynote Address to the 12th Conference, International Association of Historians of Asia*. University of Hong Kong, 1991), pp. 10-30.
21. "Student Movements in Chinese History and the Future of Democracy in

China," in Peter Li, Steven Mark, and Marjorie H. Li, eds., *Culture and Politics in China: An Anatomy of Tiananmen Square* (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 1991), pp. 243-257.

22. "Foreword," in Hoyt Cleveland Tillman, *Confucian Discourse and Chu Hsi's Ascendancy* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1992), pp. ix-xi.
23. "Roots of Moral Crisis in China Today," *Insights on Global Ethics* 2.5 (May 1992): 7-8.
24. "The Radicalization of China in the Twentieth Century," *Daedalus, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 122.2 (Spring 1993): 125-150.
25. "Modern Chronological Biography and the Conception of Historical Scholarship," *Chinese Historians* 6.1 (Spring 1993): 31-43.
26. "Intellectual Breakthroughs in the T'ang-Sung Transition," in Willard J. Peterson, Andrew H. Plaks and Ying-shih Yü, eds., *The Power of Culture* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press, 1994), pp. 158-171.
27. "Changing Conceptions of National History in Twentieth-century China," in Erik Lönnroth, Karl Molin, Ragnar Björk, eds., *Conceptions of National History, Proceedings of Nobel Symposium* 78 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), pp. 155-174.
28. "Foreword," in Chin-shing Huang, *Philosophy, Philology and Politics in Eighteenth-century China: Li Fu and the Lu-Wang School under the Ch'ing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. ix-xv.
29. "Modernization versus Fetishism of Revolution in Twentieth-century China," in Eric Wu and Yun-han Chu, eds., *The Predicament of Modernization in East Asia* (Taipei: National Cultural Association, 1995), pp. 59-74.

30. "Zhang Xuecheng versus Dai Zhen: A Study in Intellectual Challenge and Response in Eighteenth-century China," in Philip J. Ivanhoe, ed., *Chinese Language, Thought and Culture, Nivison and His Critics* (Chicago and La Salle: Open Court, 1996), pp. 121-154.
31. "The Idea of Democracy and the Twilight of the Elite Culture in Modern China," in Ron Bontekoe and Marietta Stepaniants, eds., *Justice and Democracy: Cross-cultural Perspectives* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997), pp. 199-215.
32. "China's New Wave of Nationalism," in Larry Diamond, Marc F. Plattner, Yun-han Chu, and Hung-mao Tien, eds., *Consolidating the Third Wave Democracies* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), pp. 257-264.
33. "Business Culture and Chinese Traditions—Toward a Study of the Evolution of Merchant Culture in Chinese History," in Wang Gungwu and Wong Siu-lun, eds., *Dynamic Hong Kong: Its Business and Culture* (Hong Kong: Centre of Asian Studies, the University of Hong Kong, 1997), pp. 1-84.
34. "Confucian Ethics and Capitalism," in *The Challenge of the 21st Century, the Response of Eastern Ethics* (Asa Foundation International Symposium, Seoul, South Korea, 1998), pp. 57-77.
35. "Überlegungen zum chinesischen Geschitsdenken," in Jörn Rüsen, ed., *Westliches Geschichtsdenken: eine interkulturelle Debatte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), pp. 237-268.
36. "Democracy, Human Rights and Confucian Culture," *The Fifth Huang Hsing Foundation Hsueh Chun-tu Distinguished Lecture in Asian Studies* (Asian Studies Centre, St. Antony's College, University of Oxford, 2000), pp. 1-22.

37. "Neither Renaissance nor Enlightenment: A Historian's Reflections on the May Fourth Movement," in Milena Doleželová, ed., *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital China's May Fourth Project* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), pp. 299-324.

38. 〈中國知識人の史的考察〉，《中國——社會と文化》5（東京，1990.6）：3-22。

39. 〈現代儒學の回顧と展望——明清期の思想基調の轉換から見た儒學の現代的發展〉，《中國——社會と文化》10（1995.6）：135-179。

40. 〈西歐近代化理論とアジア〉，《綜合と多樣化——新しい變動の中の人間と社會》，法政大學第15回國際シンポジウム（東京：法政大學出版局，1996），頁65-71。

（余英時先生提供資料：陳弱水、陳熙遠先生整理）

[General Information]
书名=国史浮海开新录　　余英时教授荣退论文集